

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

A JOURNAL OF THE  
CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

VOLUME VII  
1913

Reprinted 1967 for  
Wm. DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON  
with the permission of  
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



TH

Pro

Prof. F. L.  
W. E. P.

With the  
PE



# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

EDITED BY

PROFESSOR E. V. ARNOLD, Litt.D.

AND

F. W. HALL, M.A.

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT:

J. W. MACKAIL, M.A., LL.D., *Chairman.*

Prof. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D., *Hon. Treasurer.*

E. HARRISON, M.A., *Hon. Secretary.*

Prof. F. HAVERFIELD, LL.D.,  
W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A. *(With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary representing the Council of the Classical Association.)*

H. P. RICHARDS, M.A.,  
Prof. W. RIDGEWAY, LL.D., Litt.D., Sc.D.,  
*(Representing the Oxford Philological Society. Representing the Cambridge Philological Society.)*

With the co-operation of Prof. WM. GARDNER HALE, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO: Principal W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., MCGILL UNIVERSITY, MONTREAL; Prof. T. G. TUCKER, Litt.D., UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE; Prof. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D., HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME VII

1913

Reprinted 1967 for  
Wm. DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON  
with the permission of  
THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

RBA  
Classical

ORIGINALLY PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY  
 BILLING & SONS, GUILDFORD.  
 REPRINTED OFFSET LITHO BY BIDDLES LTD.,  
 THE CITY PRESS, GUILDFORD, SURREY.

Notes on  
 Notes on  
 Pisistratus  
 Plato, *Soph*  
 Notes and  
 A Correct  
 The Epita  
 The True

# *Summaries*

Liter

Lang

The Class

The Plot  
 Some Rec  
 The Argu  
 Notes and  
 Manilius,  
 Notes on  
 Note on E  
 Plautus, *A*  
 Catulliana  
 The *Pluva*  
 A Proble  
 Sophocles  
 Diogenes

# *Summaries*

Liter

Lang

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## No. 1.

	PAGE
Notes on Plautus. W. M. LINDSAY . . . . .	I
Notes on Persius. A. E. HOUSMAN . . . . .	12
Pisistratus and Homer. T. W. ALLEN . . . . .	33
Plato, <i>Sophist</i> 244 C. J. COOK WILSON . . . . .	52
Notes and Suggestions on Latin Authors. T. G. TUCKER . . . . .	54
A Correction . . . . .	57
The Epitaph of Helvia Prima. H. W. GARROD . . . . .	58
The True Cause of the Peloponnesian War. G. B. GRUNDY and G. DICKINS . . . . .	59
<i>Summaries of Periodicals :</i>	
Literature and General . . . . .	63
Language . . . . .	71
The Classical Association . . . . .	72

## No. 2.

The Plot of the <i>Septem contra Thebas</i> . J. T. SHEPPARD . . . . .	73
Some Recent Theories of the Greek Modes. J. D. DENNISTON . . . . .	83
The Argument of Plato, <i>Protagoras</i> , 351B-356C. J. L. STOCKS . . . . .	100
Notes and Suggestions on Latin Authors ( <i>continued</i> ). T. G. TUCKER . . . . .	105
Manilius, Augustus, Tiberius, Capricornus and Libra. A. E. HOUSMAN . . . . .	109
Notes on Festus. W. M. LINDSAY . . . . .	115
Note on Plautus. W. M. LINDSAY . . . . .	119
Plautus, <i>Bacchides</i> , 107. LOUIS HAVET . . . . .	120
Catulliana. D. A. SLATER . . . . .	122
The <i>Pluvialis Maiestatis</i> in Homer. A. SHEWAN . . . . .	129
A Problem in the Corinthian War. E. HARRISON . . . . .	132
Sophocles, <i>Trachiniae</i> , 1064-5. E. HARRISON . . . . .	133
Diogenes Laertius I. 2, 56. ALEX. PALLIS . . . . .	134
<i>Summaries of Periodicals :</i>	
Literature and General . . . . .	135
Language . . . . .	144

## No. 3.

	PAGE
Thucydidea. H. RICHARDS . . . . .	145
The Impiety of Socrates. A. S. FERGUSON . . . . .	157
<i>Eῖς</i> ΠΟΘΥ (Theocritus, <i>Id.</i> I. 139, 140). HENRY W. PRESCOTT . . . . .	176
The Dream of Ennius. W. R. HARDIE . . . . .	188
De Tunica Lintea. J. VAN WAGENINGEN . . . . .	196
On the Egyptian Expedition of 459-4 B.C. M. O. B. CASPARI . . . . .	198
Syntax and Etymology. EDWIN W. FAY . . . . .	202

*Summaries of Periodicals :*

Literature and General . . . . .	208
Language . . . . .	216

## No. 4.

Hesiodica. HUGH G. EVELYN-WHITE . . . . .	217
The Canonicity of Homer. T. W. ALLEN . . . . .	221
Does the <i>Odyssey</i> imitate the <i>Iliad</i> ? A. SHEWAN . . . . .	234
Thucydidea ( <i>continued</i> ). H. RICHARDS . . . . .	243
Aeneas Tacticus and Stichometry. L. W. HUNTER . . . . .	256
The Modification of Plan in Plato's <i>Republic</i> . R. HACKFORTH . . . . .	265
Notes on Trebatius the Velian. F. PRÉCHAC . . . . .	273
Lucretius IV. 1223-1228. ARTHUR PLATT . . . . .	282

*Summaries of Periodicals :*

Literature and General . . . . .	283
Language . . . . .	288
INDICES TO VOL. VII. . . . .	289

TH

EGY  
Hibeh fr  
pro and  
then Pla  
expect.  
and see  
Clearly  
come fro  
Scene (o  
after a li

a puzzli  
next Sce  
lately fo  
unaccom  
approach  
New Co  
primitive  
band of  
first Act)  
were not  
κῶμος-da  
out to be  
was anno  
himself o  
from the  
much as  
However  
NO. I.

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

JANUARY, 1918.

## NOTES ON PLAUTVS.

EGYPT has not yet given us a Greek original of Plautus, unless the paltry Hibeh fragments (I, p. 24) belong to the original of the Aulularia. (For the pro and con, see Blass, *Rhein. Mus.* 62, 102; Leo, *Herm.* 41, 629.) If they do, then Plautus departed widely from the Greek. And that is what one would expect. Read any 'sermo' in Plautus (in sermonibus Plautus poscit palmam) and see how recklessly he abandons himself to the vagaries of his humour. Clearly no 'icily regular' Greek is his guide there. Still a ray of light has come from Egypt that illumines one dark spot in Plautus, the end of the first Scene (or rather Act) of the *Bacchides*. The two sisters retreat into the house after a line which appears in our editions in this form (v. 107):

Simul huic nescioquoi, turbare qui huc it, decedamus hinc,

a puzzling line, since it is two persons, Lydus and Pistoclerus, who open the next Scene, and not one 'nescioquis.' Among the Greek Comedy fragments lately found in Egypt are some with the entry XOPOT (scil. κομμάτιον), unaccompanied by any words, but with a reference in the context to the approach of a band of revellers. So a Chorus was, after all, known to the New Comedy, though not the expensive choir of the Old Comedy. The primitive κῶμος, from which Comedy takes its name, had been revived. A band of revellers occupied the stage at the end of an Act (perhaps only the first Act) and danced or sang (or both); although, if they sang, the words were not recorded in the libretto. The first Act in the *Bacchides* ended with a κῶμος-dance (or song); and the puzzling line, bracketed by most editors, turns out to be an intimation of the approach of the κῶμος. Everyone, when this was announced by Leo, felt inclined to emend *turbare* into *turbae*, but restrained himself on second thoughts, since *turba* in Plautus' diction has not quite passed from the sense of *turbatio* to that of *homines frequentes*; though it really is used much as Cicero would use it in lines like *Poen.* 265 *turba est nunc apud aram*. However a re-examination of the best MS. (B) shews that *turbare* is there

corrected from *turbæ*, so that we may believe *turbæ* to have been the reading of the archetype :

Símul huic nescioquóí turbæ, quæ húc it, decedámus hinc.

(A résumé of the XOPOT discovery and its application to Plautus and Terence is given in my forthcoming Report on Plautus in Bursian's *Jahresbericht* of this year.)

From this we may learn a lesson of caution in handling lines, which appear in both branches (AP) of the text's tradition in an incomprehensible or apparently unmetrical form. This part of the *Bacchides* in A happens to have been lost; but we may be sure that the line had the same form in A as in P. Here would have been an apparently certain case of 'an error common to both recensions.' Leo in his *Plautinische Forschungen* (of which a second edition has just appeared) collected a fairly large list of these errors, and used them as evidence that the two recensions come from one and the same source, a very defective text compiled in Hadrian's time. In my *Ancient Editions of Plautus* I shewed that most of these were merely the 'inevitable errors' that are sure to appear sooner or later in transcription, so that we have no ground for believing that they belonged to a common original of A and P. For some, at least, of the residue we had better wait and see whether no new light is to be shed on them too, as it has been on this line of the *Bacchides*.

In the *Truculentus* (in the conversation between Astaphium and the impoverished Diniarchus) v. 180 is followed by this line in P :

Amantes siquid non danunt—non didici fabulari,

but in A by this line :

Amantis sicui quod dabo non est—non didici fabulari.

Probably this is not a case of rival versions in the two recensions. It should rather be emended, as Prof. Sonnenschein (*Class. Rev.* 19, 314) emended *Merc.* 319. I propose :

AST. Amántes siquid nón danunt—non dídici fabulári.

DIN. Amans síqui 'quod non ést dabo?'—non dídici fabulári.

Of 'inevitable errors' one of the most 'inevitable' is the suppression of one of two identical neighbouring words. A line on Leo's list, *Poen.* 969, seems a case in point :

Cretást profecto, <créta> horum hominum orátio.

Cf. Plin. *Nat. Hist.* 2, 1, 4 furor est profecto, furor. My previous conjecture was faulty in rhythm : Cretást, <cretást> p. An apparently unmetrical line on the list, *Poen.* 1317 :

Cur non adhibuisti, dum istaec loquere, tympanum ?,

is probably to be scanned with quadrisyllabic adhibuisti; for Lucilius makes *maluisti* a trisyllable, and Plautus often makes *fuisti*, *fuisse* disyllables.

Plautus sometimes puts an exclamation 'extra metrum' (e.g. eu ecator

Stich. 24  
Mil. 105

But in o

Another  
may prin

The MS  
MSS. kn  
able from

Ano  
editors w  
the end  
with a s  
line on  
(Haud H

The  
transposi

No apolo

Quoi . .  
de m  
Sumne .  
Satis

Similarly

which di  
Breviant

Very  
grammar  
plays by  
Fortun.

*Thesaurus*  
what we  
*Plautus* is



*Stich.* 243, *Mil.* 1066; au *Stich.* 259; st *Poen.* 609, *Pseud.* 129; age *Stich.* 723, *Mil.* 1054). Modern editors print these in a separate line, e.g. *Stich.* 259:

CR. Au!

Nullán tibi lingua est? GE. Quae quidem dicát 'dabo.'

But in our MSS. they are merely set at the beginning of the verse:

CR. Au! nullan tibi, etc.

Another line on Leo's list is perhaps to be explained by this practice. We may print *Trin.* 495 thus:

STAS. A! (or Ah!)

Mírúm quin tú Illo técum diutiás feras.

The MSS. have *An mirum*. Everyone who has occupied himself with Latin MSS. knows that the interjection *a* with the apex above is often indistinguishable from *an* or *am* (written *ā*).

Another point of difference between the practice of ancient and modern editors was in line-division. An opening syllable which metrically belonged to the end of a line was written at the beginning of the next line. Similarly with a small word which begins a sentence. I have already explained one line on Leo's list in this way: *Men.* 200-1 subcingulum, haud | Hercules (Haud Hercules AP).

The rhythm in some other passages will be improved, if we allow a like transposition, e.g. *Capt.* 69-70:

Iuuéntus nomen índidit Scortó mi eo

Quia ínuocatus sóleo esse in conuíuio. (*Eo quia* MSS.)

No apology need be made for writing *Pers.* 470 sqq. as two systemata:

Quoi . . . lucri; nam Ego . . . in dies. it(a) Ancilla . . . uicit. Iám . . .  
de meo.

Sumne . . . ciuitatem Maxumam . . . femina? sed Ut . . . credidi! nec  
Satis . . . omnibus.

Similarly *Cist.* 5-6:

Nescio . . . arbitror it(a) Omnibus . . . dedistis,

which dispenses with the awkward shortening (under the Law of Breves Breviantes) *it(a) ómnibus*.

Very useful work has been done by Dr. Löfstedt recently for Plautine grammar and diction. He has justified several strange expressions in the plays by parallels from later Latin, e.g. boni 'de bono' *Poen.* 641, Venant. Fortun. *carm.* 6, 5, 168 si uenit, ipsa mihi nuntiet aura boni. The new *Thesaurus* is teaching us that Cicero's grammar and diction are not always what we call 'Ciceronian,' and the lesson to be learned from my *Syntax of Plautus* is that Plautine Latin does not follow such hard and fast rules as most

editors have believed. To the other examples of accusative after a verb compounded with *in* we must add *Most.* 871 (bacchiac):

Malum quom impluit ceteros, ne impluat me (*mi* MSS.),

for the pronoun here is emphatic, and *mihī*, not *mi*, is the emphatic form.

Let me digress for a moment and suggest to anyone who has leisure and inclination how helpful to editors of Plautus would be a full statement of the metrical treatment of Pronouns in the plays. Here are two things which, I fancy, would be established: (1) that *mater-mea*, etc., are word-groups, so that a Trochaic line cannot begin *Séd mater mea dixit* (but *Séd mea mater dixit*), just as it cannot begin *Séd matertera dixit*. If this is established, Synizesis is established for Plautus, since in a line like *Amph.* 458:

Nam híc quidem omnem imáginem meam, quae ántehac fuerat, póssidet,  
we must scan *mēām*, not *mēm*. Of course, when the Pronoun is emphatic (*mater mea*, non tua), there will be no Enclisis, e.g. possibly *Capt.* 316, if the true scansion is:

Quám tu filiúm tuóm, tam pater me meu' desiderat;

(2) that, after a short syllable (giving opportunity for the Law of Breves Breviantes), the unemphatic form is normally *ille*, *illi* (e.g. *séd ille*, *ét ille*, *quód ille*, etc.), the emphatic *ille*, *illi*, *illic*, etc. (this last, because the enclitic *-ce* makes the word oxytone, *illíc*, *illínc*, etc.). If this be demonstrated, then the worthlessness of the arguments for *ille* as an early Latin pronunciation (after long as after short syllables) will be demonstrated too.

To return to the subject of Grammar. Two lines on Leo's list seem not outside the scope of Plautine elasticity:

*Trin.* 293 Hícce ego te (de *edd.*) artibus gratiam facio ne colas neue imbuas  
tuom ingenium,

538 Magis 'apage' dicas si omnia mē audiueris (ex me aud. *edd.*).

(Jacobsohn's Law of Hiatus and Syllaba Anceps before an ending like *audiueris* must be pronounced 'not proven.') Although our text of the *Truculentus* is, where P is our only guide, notoriously corrupt, the *scistis* of v. 105 perhaps need not be changed to *scitis*, now that Löfstedt has made it probable that the analogy of *noui* led in everyday Latin to a misuse of *sciui* as *scio*, of *nesciui* (*Capt.* 265; *Poen.* 629) as *nescio*. Leo strangely uses the corrupt state of the text as evidence that only one copy of this play was available in Hadrian's time, the rest having been lost, and that this copy was in a shocking condition. On the contrary the parts preserved in A and the passages quoted by writers later than Hadrian shew a quite respectable text. It is clearly some accident in the transmission of P that has caused the trouble. The opening lines we get from Apuleius *Florid.* 4, 18 and Priscian 2, 421 in this correct shape:

Perparuam partem postulat Plautus loci  
De uestris magnis atque amoenis moenibus,  
Athenas quo sine architectis conferat.

They ap

The new  
only to  
perhaps  
abbrevi  
of our th  
faithful  
is not fo  
far from  
We hav

AS

Instead  
in menti  
'carve  
made so  
first hal  
scribe w  
separate

Luckily  
saepe a  
mention  
the Sup  
Plautus  
audittat  
Mu  
of this e  
(and Cic  
multo ta  
pecunia  
the quar  
line wro

PI.

Plautus  
prefers  
conueni  
is rather

They appear in P thus :

Perparuam artem postulat *plaudi locum*  
*Deum eris* magnis atque amoenis moenibus,  
 Athenas quo sine *arcus pletis* conferat.

The new advance in the study of Palaeography led by Traube enables us not only to explain the corruption in the second line but to date it; yes! and perhaps to localize it too. The scribe of the original had used the rare abbreviation *ueris* for *uestris*. To the tenth or eleventh century German scribes of our three MSS. (BCD) *Deueris* could only mean *Deum eris* (B, always the most faithful of the three transcripts, has *Deueris*). This abbreviation *ueris* 'uestris' is not found before the ninth century. So that the corrupt form of the line, so far from existing before Hadrian's time, did not appear till after Charlemagne's! We have not the evidence of A for this line, but we have for v. 273:

AST. Nunc places, cum mi inclementer dicis. TRVC. Quid hoc quod te rogo?

Instead of *cum mi (mei ?) inclementer* we find in P (i.e. in BCD) *cum me illi uel in mentiri*. The scribe clearly had the correct version before him, but did not 'carve the joints' rightly. He broke up *inclementer* into *incle menter*. He made some sense out of the second half by changing it to *mentiri*. For the first half he conjectured *illi* or *in*. This suggests a very ignorant mediaeval scribe with a faded majuscule original before him, in which the words were not separated. Both A and P leave us in the lurch at v. 167:

Auditau (A : Autdiui P) saepe hoc uolgo dicier.

Luckily the MSS. of Paulus' Epitome of Festus give us a clue: Audiuitau: saepe audiui. There is one form that would suit all these variants, but to mention it requires some courage. The Frequentative of *lego* is *lectito* (from the Supine *lectum*), of *uenio* is *uentito* (from the Supine *uentum*). May not Plautus have used *auditito* (from the Supine *auditum*)? The Pleonasm *audititau saepe* is quite in the Plautine manner.

Much still remains to be discovered of the niceties of grammar and diction of this early period. Since Havet shewed that *tanta* was really used by Plautus (and Cicero too) where editors had printed *tanto* in phrases like *bis tanta pluvius*, *multo tanta amplius*, the favourite explanation of the usage has been to supply *pecunia* with *tanta*: 'with this amount of money I bought or could buy twice the quantity.' But Plautus himself seems to reveal the true explanation in a line wrongly suspected by editors, *Stich.* 339:

PI. Nimio in parti multo tanta plus quam speras. PAN. Salua sum.

Plautus' predilection for the Attraction of the Antecedent is very strong. He prefers *Naucratem* to *Naucrates* in a phrase like *Amph.* 1009 *Naucratem quem conuenire uolui in naui non erat*. In other words his aspect of such sentences is rather *quem Naucratem* than *Naucrates erat*. We may remove from Leo's list

of 'errors common to the two recensions' the middle line of this passage, *Trin.* 767-9:

Is homo exornetur graphice in peregrinum modum,  
Ignota facies quae non uisitata sit,  
Mendaciloquom aliquem,

by supposing that Plautus' aspect of the sentence was *quae ignota facies*. And perhaps this is the explanation of *Pseud.* 805 (where the Metre requires the deletion of the *et* between the two Superlatives):

Nemo illum quaerit qui optimum carissimust,

unless the meaning is 'qui, cum sit optimus, carissimus est.' Plautus seems always to use *dice*, etc., and not *dic*, etc., unless the Imperative is closely joined to a word beginning with a consonant, e.g. *dic mihi*. We must therefore reject Bothe's presentation of *Pseud.* 488:

SI. Faterere, dic. PS. Καὶ τοῦτο ναί, καὶ τοῦτο ναί,

and rather print the line so as to make Simo quote the words of Pseudolus in v. 484, thus:

SI. Faterere, dic καὶ τοῦτο ναί. PS. Καὶ τοῦτο ναί.

Since *erum* is emphatic, the P-reading seems preferable in *Most.* 992:

Mihi, nisi érum ut (or *uti*) métuam et currem, níl est qui tergúm tegam.

Where the critics of last generation said 'Plautus never allows this or that construction,' we should often rather substitute 'hardly ever' for 'never,' now that the elasticity of Plautine Syntax is becoming more apparent. The same caution should be observed in dealing with unusual forms of words. The termination *-tus* (Indo-european *-tōs*) originally indicated 'from,' e.g. *funditus* 'from the base.' Although *penitus* is elsewhere an Adjective in Plautus (e.g. *faucibus penitissimis*), he may quite well have used the Adverb in its original sense of 'from within' (not necessarily, as Leo asserts, 'from the innermost nook'; *penes me* does not mean 'in my innermost nook') in *Pseud.* 132:

Atque ipse egreditur pénitus periuri caput (AP).

Instead of 'taking the gifts the gods provide,' Leo includes this in his 'list of errors common to the two recensions,' because it is a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*. But Plautus has several *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα*. And this Adverb must have originally meant 'from within,' before it came to take its classical Latin meaning. Leo seems to me quite wrong in insisting that Plautus could have used no other word here than *intus*; and I hope that the *Thesaurus* editors will not be induced to refuse this interesting example of *penitus* in its older sense. Plautus likes Alliteration, and may have preferred *penitus* here, because *periuri* follows. Since the Interjection *perí* represents *perii*, elision of the second syllable seems harsh. If the MSS. are right, this occurs in

*Cist.* 287 AL. I, curre, equom adfer. SER. Pérí hercle hic insanít miser.  
*Bacch.* 52 Dúαε unum expetitis palumbem; pérí harundo alas uérberat.

In the second example the division of the Anapaest is, in this part of the line, perfectly legitimate. The elision *per(ē)* is not so impossible as the scansion *harūndo*. Where is the evidence that the elision of the last syllable of *harundo* caused retrogression of the accent?

Seyffert said that *potin* was never used by Plautus at the end of a line or hemistich. But if we consider the 'raison d'être' for this, we shall be inclined to change 'never' into 'hardly ever,' and retain the reading of the MSS. in *Pseud.* 263 (cretic):

BA. Ámbulà tú. PS. Potin út semél modò?

When once Lodge's *Lexicon of Plautus* is finished, a good many of these pronouncements of critics of the last generation will lose their terrors for us. We shall see on how few examples and how limited a variety of circumstances this alarming word 'never' is founded.

On the other hand, the counting of examples may often, especially in metrical matters, be turned from a 'bad master' into a 'good servant.' A tribrach can form the first foot of an iambic as well as of a trochaic line. But when we consider the frequency of trochaic lines, with this first foot, which begin with a pyrrhic word, e.g. *Poen.* 582 *Prōbūs hōmost*, the rarity of iambic lines beginning *Prōbūs hōmost*, etc., is significant. Plautus apparently dislikes in openings of iambic lines, a tribrach with a resolved rise divided between two words (~ ~ ~). He uses freely in iambic lines a proceleusmatic opening like *itā faciēt*, but avoids a tribrach opening like *itā facit*. This observation should at least make us select out of the two possible scansions of *Curc.* 88 the scansion with elision at the change of speaker:

PA. Ita faciām. PH. Agite bibite festivaē fores.

It should make us doubtful about the emendation of *Men.* 31 (Puer inter homines aberravit a patre MSS.):

Puēr aberravit inter homines á patre.

And it should make us favour some easy emendation (e.g. *edidicere* Marx, *nullam* Spengel) of *Rud.* 291, with second hemistich: nequē (nec MSS.) *didicere artem ūllam*. But ought we to go further? Ought we to say that the quantity *pietēr* is proved by the lines:

*Pers.* 57 Patēr, auos, proauos, ábauos, atauos, trítauos,

355 Patēr, hominum immortalis est infámia.

*Mil.* 373 (second hemistich) patēr, auos, proauos, ábauos,

or the quantity *pietas* (the original quantity of this word) by the line:

*Poen.* 1137 Tua pietas nobís plane auxilió fuit (AP)?

Perhaps someone who has leisure will make a thorough investigation of this problem and bring Klotz (pp. 257 sqq.) up to date. Here are all the examples which I have noticed in a hasty survey of the plays:

*Cas.* 311 Era qua[m] istam opera a me impetres, quod postulas (Era quā istanc ?),

*Cist.* 50 (second hemistich) sine meo saepe eri' sumptu,

151 Ita properavit de puellae proloqui,

567 Anus ei amplexa est genua plorans, obsecrans (Anus ēi ? Anus ēi ?  
Cf. *Rud.* 25, 49, *Trin.* 111),

*Men.* 236. Mare superum omne Graeciamque exoticam (Mare súperum-que o. ?),

*Most.* 685 Ita mea consilia undique oppugnas male (but in v. 656 Ita méa consilia, etc.),

*Pers.* 255 Quia meo amico amiciter hanc commoditatis copiam (Quia mēo ?),

*Poen.* 467 Mina mihi argenti dono postilla datast (Mina míhi ?),

*Rud.* 166 Neque gubernator umquam potuit tam bene.

The words of *Merc.* 227, *Rud.* 596 are certain, since the line is repeated almost unchanged, but this may be rather a proof that *uelut* should be written *uel ut* in Plautus:

*Merc.* 227 Vel út ego nocte hac quae praeteriit próxuma,

*Rud.* 596 Vel út ego hac nocte quae processit próxuma;

and similarly in *Truc.* 246 (according to P):

Vel út hic agrestis ést adulescens quae híc habet,

where A offers a trochaic line:

Vel ut hic ést adúlscens qui habita[n]t híc agrestis rústicus.

The problem is well worth investigation. For in other circumstances Plautus seems not to object to this type of the resolved rise of a tribrach, e.g., *Rud.* 1001 (trochaic):

GR. Quód scelūs hódie hóc inveni! TR. Vérba facimus: ít dies.

In *Stich.* 90 (trochaic), since *mi pater* makes a word-group, we must scan:

PAM. Sálué, mi patér. AN. Et uos ambae. flico agite adsíditē;

but the quantity may be due to the license of Syllaba Anceps at change of speaker.

Sudhaus' attempt to explain the Cantica of Plautus is a failure (see Leo's review in *Gött. Gel. Anz.* 1911). It seems likely that Plautus used greater variety of metres than has yet been supposed. Is it too rash to suggest Palimbacchiac (---) for the steps of Pseudolus' dance at *Pseud.* 1276 (tetrameter catalectic):

Plaúdúnt 'parúm' clámitánt mi út revórtár?

In colloquial Latin *haec* may be used for *haec manus* (e.g. *Epid.* 10). Perhaps we should read *meis* (*mis* is the abbreviation) *his* for *manibus* *his* of the MSS. (= P) in *Epid.* 353 ego resolui, Meis his denumeravi. I need hardly say that Leo's theory that Plautus elided final -ūs (like final *um*) before a



vowel. e.g. *Manib(us) his*, is a hopelessly improbable theory. Leo supposes that in the twenty years' interval between Plautus' death and Terence's first play all trace of this practice had been so effectively abolished by Ennius' literary reforms that subsequent Plautine critics, like Accius, Aelius Stilo, Varro, were quite unaware that it had ever existed. This is a recrudescence of Ritschl's obsolete notion of Ennius' influence on the language. Ritschl did not recognize the Law of Breves Breviantes, and thought that a Plautine scansion like *amānt, ferūnt* implied that Latin was losing its terminations and was passing into a state of decay, like some of the dialects of ancient Italy (cf. *deda* 'dedant' on dialectal inscriptions), a state from which it was rescued by Ennius. A truer account of the extent of Ennius' reforms will be found in Skutsch's article 'Ennius' in Pauly-Wissowa's Encyclopædia. Most of Leo's theories in his *Plautinische Forschungen* (on Abl. Sing. in *-d*, on the suppression of *-s* before a vowel, and of *-m* before a consonant, on the extent of the retouching of the plays by stage-managers in order to make them intelligible and metrical to an audience in Terence's time and later) are founded on the illusion that Plautine Latin was vastly more archaic than Terentian. Common sense should show us that vast changes are not produced in a language in so short a space as twenty or thirty years. Plautus could not use Leo's primitive scansions *manib(us) his* and *cām machaera*. Even *auspiciod hodie optumo* is too archaic for Plautus.

Let me end with a correction of the Oxford text. In *Pseud.* 997 :

SI. Properá pellegere epístulam ergo. BA. 'Id ago; tacitus sis modo,

I ought to have preferred this reading of A to the reading of P: *id ago, si taceas modo*. Here the Palimpsest, as usual, offers the 'ipsa uerba' of Plautus; the Palatine MSS. offer the 'Revival' version, i.e. the alteration made by a stage-manager when the play was revived. In Early Latin the type of Conjugation, of which, e.g. *soleo, solitus sum, solere* survives in the classical accidence, was widely spread. Often it has left a trace of itself in an Adjective. *Maestus* is a relic of *maereo, maestus sum, maerere*; *tacitus* of *taceo, tacitus sum, tacere*. Some interesting details of this usage will be found in a Greifswald dissertation (J. B. Hofmann: *de Verbis quae in prisca Latinitate extant Deponentibus*, 1910). Now, if it be a feature of A (as I have tried to prove in my *Ancient Editions of Plautus*) that, where a passage shows two versions, the Plautine and the 'Revival' version, A nearly always adopts the Plautine version, does not that point to the A-recension, of which A (the Ambrosian Palimpsest) is a more or less altered copy, having been a 'scholar's edition' of Plautus? The few intrusions of 'Revival' versions, alongside of, or instead of, the Plautine in A, we may ascribe to the owner of the original from which A was transcribed. He had jotted down in the margin of his MS. some 'Revival' versions from the other recension. Leo's theory is that Probus, the 'sospitator scriptorum antiquiorum,' rescued from oblivion a few inadequate copies of single plays, and that our two recensions (which Leo

refers to the third or fourth century A.D.) come ultimately from this inadequate material collected by Probus. But how could a third or fourth century editor make so successful a selection of the genuine versions? The time for a 'scholar's edition' like this was rather the time of Varro or Verrius Flaccus. That is the difficulty which I feel about Leo's theory. Leo apparently does not feel it, for in his second edition he repeats the theory in the form in which it appeared in his first edition some eighteen years ago. He believes that Plautus, with all the older writers (except Terence), disappeared from Italian bookshops and libraries in the interval between Verrius Flaccus and Probus (rather a short interval for so overwhelming a cataclysm); that Probus managed to find stray copies of single plays at Berytus; that from the material he collected a text was compiled in Hadrian's time; that this text was the source of all subsequent editions, two of which have survived to modern times. Probus' copies would, he says, be derived from theatre-copies, exhibiting the 'Revival' versions of passages which had been altered by stage-managers, but preserving record also of older settings. Leo's picture seems to me to suit the P-recension better than the other; for in P we have normally the 'Revival' versions, but along with them often the genuine versions too. Since Leo's first edition we have learned the details (fairly full for the first three plays) of another third or fourth century text of Plautus, the text used by Nonius. I gave an account of its readings and scholia in an article in *Philologus* (63, 273-296), and demonstrated that it was quite of the P-type (and therefore not of the A-type). The few divergences it showed from the P-text were such as might appear in two editions based on the same original material, or in two copies of the same edition. So that the one new scrap of evidence that has turned up, since Leo first published his theory, rather favours the rival theory, that the A-recension comes from the time of Varro or Verrius Flaccus, while the P-recension and the text used by Nonius may come from the text compiled in the Hadrian age from Probus' collected materials. I was curious to see how Leo would use this new piece of evidence in his second edition. I find that (as he so often does) he mis-states it. He says (p. 16) that the text used by Nonius 'stand zwischen A und P.' No! most emphatically, it did not. It was a close neighbour of P, and therefore a complete stranger to A.

The truth is, we have not sufficient material for the history of the Plautine text in antiquity. Only guesswork is possible. Leo, who takes his theory very seriously indeed, speaks as if the 'ipsa uerba' of Plautus were usually gone beyond recall, all that remains being the more or less successful attempts of third and fourth century editors to tinker into intelligible shape woefully distorted material. That is the same type of 'higher criticism' that finds in the Winstedt fragment a fourth century imitation of Juvenal. We may say of nearly every page of Plautus: *eapse cantat quōia sit*.

The twentieth century has not, so far, much helped Plautus-study. We may look for help to two quarters, the sands of Egypt and the town libraries

of France. From Egypt is sure to come, sooner or later, a fragment of a Greek original of Plautus, large enough to give us some real notion of Plautus' actual method of work and (I expect) to curb the excesses of the Contaminatio- and Interpolatio- and Retractatio-hunters. In some Bibliothèque de Ville there is in all probability now lurking a collation of Turnèbe's famous codex, the lost Sens fragment. The collation is probably written on the margins of a sixteenth-century edition, very likely a Gryphius edition (I see it in my dreams!); for that was the favourite text in France at the time. If the readers of this paper would make a practice of calling at the public library in every French town they visit, of searching the catalogue for sixteenth-century copies of Plautus, of transcribing a portion of any written marginalia in, let us say, the *Poenulus* and *Persa*, and of comparing their transcript with the readings of the *Codex Turnebi*,—if all this (which will not be done) were to be done, then the next report on Plautus in Bursian's *Jahresbericht* would have more to chronicle than this year's report can find.

W. M. LINDSAY.

## NOTES ON PERSIVS.

I 5-12.

non, si quid turbida Roma 5  
eleuet, accedas examenque improbum in illa  
castiges trutina, nec te quaesiuieris extra.  
nam Romae quis non—a, si fas dicere! sed fas  
tum, cum ad canitiem, et nostrum istud uiuere triste  
aspexi ac nucibus facimus quaecumque relictis, 10  
cum sapimus patruos. tunc, tunc—ignoscite (nolo,  
quid faciam?)—sed (sum petulanti splene) cachinno.

'If Rome, addlepat that she is, misprises a thing, let that be no concern of yours. For at Rome every living soul—ah, would that I might utter it! But utter it I surely may, when I consider what dismal old squaretoes we are from the day when we are boys no more. Then, then—forgive me (I don't wish it, I can't help it)—but (this spleen of mine is to blame) I do burst out laughing.'

Down to the middle of u. 11 my text and punctuation are those of most editors, and I shall uphold them against the MS readings retained by Casaubon and recalled by Buecheler. From that point onward the punctuation is my own, except that it partly agrees with K. F. Hermann's, adopted in 1910 by Mr Leo.

In 8 the MSS have *Romae est* or *Romaest* for *Romae* and *ac* for *a*,

nam Romae est quis non? ac, si fas dicere —,

and the sense will be 'for at Rome there are all sorts and conditions of men.' If so, there are wise men and good men at Rome; and that runs counter to the satirist's purpose. When in u. 50 he writes 'hoc . . . quid non intus habet?' he is careful to add words which make it clear that 'quid' signifies 'what rubbish,'—'Ilias Atti ebria ueratro' and so forth: here nothing of the kind is present. Mr Leo therefore, in spite of Buecheler's declaration 'ohne alles Bedenken ist die Ueberlieferung wieder einzusetzen,' has again expelled it, or rather he has expelled half of it: the *est*, which scribes often add or subtract, is withdrawn from the text, and the aposiopesis 'quis non —' (completed in u. 121) is reinstated; the *ac* is still retained. But when a scholar prints *ac* after an aposiopesis he ought to offer a defence of it: he

ought  
supply  
a or  
thesaur

P  
himse  
consid  
with t  
paralle  
strong  
not in

ca  
'dum  
no all  
vicious  
any da  
combi

S  
scholi  
of the  
wanto  
of the

their  
inform  
lay-fig  
editor  
even s  
chops  
and n  
is the  
some  
others  
others  
locute  
thoug  
may b

T  
imme  
cachin  
which  
design

ought to show how this conjunction is capable of this employment, and to supply what the *thesaurus linguae Latinae* does not supply, a parallel. The *a* or *ah* of most editors is at any rate appropriate; and this word, as the *thesaurus* remarks, 'uarie deprauatum est, in *at*, *ac*, *au*, *aut*, *al*.'

Persius, on the verge of saying that all Rome has asses' ears, checks himself for a moment, and then reflects that after all he may well proceed, considering the facts. The facts are given in 'tum cum . . . aspexi,' and with this clause must 'sed fas' be connected: commentators have cited the parallel of Soph. frag. 855 14 εἰ μοι θέμις, θέμις δὲ τὰ ληθὴ λέγειν. The strong stop therefore is to be placed in 11 after 'patruos' with most editors, not in 8 after 'sed fas' with Messrs Némethy and Leo.

*canities* in 9 means much the same as *senectus* in Hor. *epod.* 13 4 sq. 'dumque uirent genua ! et decet, obducta soluatur fronte senectus.' There is no allusion to anything so irrelevant as premature decrepitude brought on by vicious indulgence. Persius had observed in Rome, what scholars may observe any day without going so far, that a dreary mode of speech or writing is often combined with frivolity of thought, and that the combination is ridiculous.

So now we proceed to 11 and 12. 'ordo: tunc tunc cachinno' says the scholiast, and that is the clue to the labyrinth. *cachinno* is a verb, and most of the misery in which editors entangle themselves and their readers has been wantonly created by attempts to make a noun of it. When they print, as most of them do,

tunc, tunc ignoscite. 'nolo.'

quid faciam? sed sum petulanti splene cachinno,

their *nolo* and their *sed* are both absurd. The interlocutor, as Persius himself informs us at 44 ('quisquis es, o modo quem ex aduerso dicere feci'), is a mere lay-figure with no individual features: here, suddenly and for an instant, the editors endow him with a character of stupid impertinence. Persius is not even speaking to him, 'ignoscite' he is saying, not 'ignosce,' when the other chops in with a boorish and purposeless 'I won't.' There the incident closes, and nothing comes of it; thenceforward he is a lay-figure again. Next there is the problem of *sed*. This troublesome conjunction is variously handled: some simply translate it 'but,' without caring what nonsense that makes; others with equal simplicity and even greater cynicism translate it 'for'; others very naturally desire to substitute *nam*; others suppose that the interlocutor must have made an inaudible reply, or rather a reply inaudible to us though apparently audible to Persius. And all this for what? that *cachinno* may be a noun.

The difficulty is that *sed* cannot join what immediately precedes to what immediately follows; and the solution is that it does not: it joins *ignoscite* to *cachinno*. These three words, 'forgive me, but I laugh,' are the thread on which everything else is strung. *nolo* and *quid faciam* are a parenthesis designed to justify the request *ignoscite: nolo* ('ἐκλειψας, dicere uel ridere')

schol.) means 'nolo cachinnare,' 'I don't laugh on purpose,' and *quid faciam* (Hor. *serm.* II 1 24, Verg. *buc.* I 41, VII 13, 'excusandi formula' says Ruhnken at Ouid. *her.* VIII 50) means 'aliter facere non possum,' 'I can't help laughing.' *sum petulanti splene* (abl. qualitatis as in V 109 'es . . . presso lare') is a similar parenthesis designed to account for the action *cachinno*: it means 'I have a saucy spleen'; 'talīs sum naturae ut rideam' says the scholiast, and adds 'secundum physicos dicit, qui dicunt homines splene ridere.'

Hermann, if I understand his punctuation aright, interprets *nolo* and *quid faciam* as I do, but takes the construction to be 'ignoscite sed sum petulanti splene,' in which *sed* does not receive its proper force.

I 22, 23.

tun, uetule, auriculis alienis colligis escas,  
articulis quibus et dicas cute perditus 'ohe'?

*articulis quibus* Madvig *adu. crit.* II p. 128 for *auriculis, quibus*. The construction is 'colligis escas, quibus escis "ohe" dicas, articulis et cute perditus'; the sense is 'what! catering at your age for others' ears with cates which you, disabled by gout and dropsy, must yourself forgo?' The reference of a relative to the more distant of two preceding nouns is common even in prose and illustrated in dictionaries; the position of *dicas* in the sentence is that of *similis* in III 16 sq. 'teneroque columbo | et similis regum pueris'; the meaning of *cute perditus* can be gathered from III 63 'cum iam cutis aegra tumebit,' and of *articulis perditus* from V 58 sq. 'cum lapidosa cheragra | fecerit articulos ueteris ramalia fagi.' In short, the correction has no flaw.

Buecheler in 1886, *Rhein. Mus.* XLI p. 457, without attempting a defence of the MS reading, made a show of impugning Madvig's. I pointed out in 1903, *Manil.* I p. xlv, that Buecheler had not even read the arguments which he was trying to answer. This he had already discovered for himself: some time after 1886 he did read Madvig's criticism, and recognised that it was unanswerable; and in 1893, though retaining *auriculis*, he followed Madvig in removing the comma. This punctuation has been mechanically copied into other texts of Persius and into the *thes. ling. Lat.*, but no notice, so far as I am aware, has ever been taken of its significance; and in Mr Leo's revision it has vanished from the text, just as Madvig's emendation, which certainly is no fit company for Mr Leo's emendations, has vanished from the note. But the punctuation is destined to reappear: it is a compromise which sooner or later will again suggest itself to some editor who is too intelligent to acquiesce in any of the old interpretations, and yet too timid or prejudiced to alter a couple of letters in the sacred text. It is therefore worth while explaining why it cannot be right. The meaning will be 'escas, quibus "ohe" dicas, auriculis et cute perditus,' i.e. deaf and dropsical. But if *auriculis* had been thus repeated, *et cute* would never have been added; and deafness neither prevents a man from perceiving the vibration of his own voice

nor from  
in his

'sp  
macran  
quibus  
a case  
the fan  
spe  
aunt or  
calls m  
If the v  
more, a  
which  
himself  
ad uiri  
saeuos

56  
aliquan  
which  
accipi;  
adds 'h  
aurea b  
'Acron  
effigies,  
autem s  
but Jah  
nusquan  
mirantu



nor from enjoying any excitement which that vibration may happen to set up in his nervous system.

## II 31-37.

ecce auia aut metuens diuum matertera cunis  
exemit puerum . . .  
tunc manibus quatit et spem macram supplice uoto 35  
nunc Licini in campos, nunc Crassi mittit in aedis:  
'hunc optent generum rex et regina.'

'*spes* qua ratione infans dicatur, facile intellegitur . . . acerbe hanc *macram* uocat poeta, ut indicet, quam parum respondeat puer ingentibus, quibus eum auia cumulat, uotis' Jahn. But who would use *macram* in such a case? who would not rather say *pusillam*? 'The pinched little hope of the family' Conington. Why pinched rather than plump, like most babies?

*spem* does not mean the baby: it means simply hope, the hope of the aunt or grandmother for the baby's wealth and glory; and this hope the poet calls *macram*, lean and therefore hungry, with an appetite not easy to satiate: *If the whole world was a cake she had the power to take, She would take it, ask for more, and eat it all.* It is likened to a herd of lean kine driven to a pasture which they strip of its herbage, as in the verses of Juvenal to which Conington himself refers, XIV 146-9 'nocte boues *macri* lassoque *famelica* collo | iumenta ad uiridis huius *mittentur* aristas | nec prius inde domum quam tota noualia saeuos | in uentres abeant, ut credas falcibus actum.'

## II 52-58.

si tibi crateras argenti incusaque pingui  
auro dona feram, sudes et pectore laeue  
excutiat guttas laetari praetrepidum cor.  
hinc illud subiit, auro sacras quod ouato 55  
perducis facies. nam fratres inter aenos,  
somnia pituita qui purgatissima mittunt,  
praecipui sunt sitque illis aurea barba.

56 '*fratres aenos*, Pollucem et Castorem, qui utique fratres fuerunt et aliquando nocte Persen Macedoniae regem nuntiauerunt uictum' schol.; to which Casaubon justly replies 'non possunt de Castore et Polluce haec accipi; apparet enim de pluribus loqui poetam quam de duobus,' and Jahn adds 'hi dii semper iuuenes repraesentabantur, nec possunt intellegi, ubi de aurea barba sermo est.' The scholiasts have another string to their bow, 'Acron tradit quod in porticu quadam Apollinis Palatini fuerint L Danaidum effigies, et contra eas sub diuo totidem equestres filiorum Aegypti. ex iis autem statu is quaedam dicebantur postulantibus per somnum dare oracula'; but Jahn makes short work of this invention: 'permirum accidit, quod nusquam Aegyptiadarum mentionem faciunt scriptores, qui Danaides admirantur; atqui quinquaginta statuæ equestres aeneae etiam Romae res erat

admiratione sane digna. porro cur Aegypti filiis statuae equestres ponerentur, nulla quantum uideo causa inueniri potest . . . uerum ut fuerint, hic eos in mente habere Persius non potuit. primum enim non est credibile Aegypti filios somnia misisse et tanquam deos fatidicos uenerationem accepisse, tum ex tali quinquaginta statuarum serie ad ordinandam porticum collocatarum, inter se igitur simillimarum, unum alterumue eximie beneficium habitum fuisse, et tali prae ceteris barbam pro lubitu deaurare licuisse, uix mihi persuadeam.' He therefore concludes 'uidentur potius fratres aeni ioculariter dii in uniuersum uocati esse, quibus omnibus statuae ex aere ponebantur.' But 'the brazen brotherhood,' as Gifford turns it, though it might mean statues in general, could not specially designate statues of the gods. Mr Leo in *Hermes* XLV p. 44 says '*fratres* ist nicht zu erklären, weder können es die 50 Aegyptos-söhne noch die Dioskuren . . . sein . . . noch die Götter im allgemeinen'; and he adds 'Römisch gedacht und ausgedrückt wäre *patres* (Lucil. 20 ff.)',—i.e. Lact. *inst.* IV 3 12 'uti nunc | nemo sit nostrum quin aut pater optimus diuum | aut Neptunus pater, Liber Saturnus pater, Mars | Ianus Quirinus pater siet ac dicatur ad unum.' The French very likely think it is 'Englisch gedacht und ausgedrückt' when they say *un milord* for a peer of the realm and *une milady* for a peeress; and these are fair parallels to Mr Leo's 'Roman' employment of *patres*.

The fact that *fratres*, whether with *aeni* or without it, is not Latin for 'gods' forms no reason why it should not signify the gods in this context. *germanus* is not Latin for a Centaur; but when Ovid in *met.* XII 240 writes 'ardescunt *germani* caede bimembres,' *germani caede* means the killing of the Centaur Eurytus. *soror* is not Latin for a lock of hair; but when the coma Berenices in Catull. 66 51 sq. says 'mea fata *sorores* | lugebant,' *sorores* means the remaining locks on Berenice's head. *fratres* itself is not Latin for volumes of poetry any more than for gods; but when the first book of Ovid's *tristia* heard from its author 'aspicies illic positos ex ordine *fratres*,' it looked forward to meeting Ovid's other books. Finally *nepotes* is no more Latin for gods than *fratres* is; but when the Berecyntian mother rides abroad through Phrygia 'centum complexa *nepotes*,' they are 'omnes caelicolae.' What Persius is saying is this: 'qui (*dei*, for *sacras facies* has preceded) somnia pituita purgatissima mittunt, ei praecipui sunt inter fratres (*suos*) aenos (*nequum inauratos*) sitque illis aurea barba.' When gods are the subject of discourse, *fratres* is Latin for 'fellow-gods.'

### III 1-62.

It would be absurd to transcribe half the satire, so I will ask the reader to take Persius in his hand and compare him with what I say.

'hanc satiram' quoth the scholiast 'poeta ex Lucilii libro quarto transtulit, castigans luxuriam et uitia diuitum.' The wealthy are not so much as mentioned in this satire. Some commentators, it is true, declare that the young man whom the first verses introduce is rich,—'a young man of wealth'

Coning  
standin  
that he  
we sha  
sine la  
other h  
(10-19)  
(or du  
himself  
(52-5).

I  
'natus  
ordinis  
Annaei  
confirm  
behavio  
16 uen  
means  
'stertim  
'stertim  
includi  
First P  
second  
rimpro  
nantis  
ingen.  
first pe

Nevert  
between  
and the  
escape  
felt to  
to the  
if they  
firmata  
me fug  
adulesc  
Stoico  
ausim'  
precon

Th  
amiss  
NO. 1

Conington, 'iuuenis diues' Némethy,—just as almost all of them, misunderstanding verses 3 and 4, which are rightly explained in the scholia, declare that he was drunk last night. But if we search the satire for his riches, all we shall find is in 24-6, 'rure paterno | est tibi far modicum, purum et sine labe salinum | (quid metuas?) cultrixque foci secunda patella.' On the other hand we shall glean a good many personal details. He is a student (10-19), a member of an old Tuscan family (28), related to the local censor (or duodenis censoria potestate quinquennalis, if that was his proper title), himself a Roman knight (29), and finally a disciple of the Stoic philosophy (52-5).

I seem to myself to have heard of this young man before. *uit. Pers.* 2 'natus in Etruria Volterris, eques Romanus, sanguine et affinitate primi ordinis iuris coniunctus.' 4 'cum esset annorum XVI amicitia coepit uti Annaei Cornuti . . . et inductus aliquatenus in philosophiam est.' And, to confirm this impression, I find that Persius, when describing this young man's behaviour, uses the first person: 3 *stertimus*, 9 *findor*, 12 *querimur*, 14 *querimur*, 16 *uenimus*. It is all in vain; he cannot make his editors believe that he means what he says. '*stertimus*, hoc est, uos iuuenes stertitis' Casaubon, '*stertimus*, prima pluralis persona cum indignatione loquentis est' Jahn, '*stertimus*, statt *stertis*' Heinrich, '*stertimus*, like *scribimus* I 13, the speaker including himself when he really only is meaning others' Conington, 'Ironical First Person, excluding the speaker' Gildersleeve, 'prima persona plur. pro secunda sing.' Némethy, 'nota la 1<sup>a</sup> plurale per attenuare l'asprezza del rimprovero, estendendolo a noi stessi' Ramorino, 'prima persona plur. indignantis est siue illius, qui alterum illudens ita facit loquentem' van Wageningen. But even this device fails them when they come, at verse 9, to the first person singular,

turgescit uitrea bilis,

*findor*, ut Arcadiae pecuaria rudere credas.

Nevertheless they are not at the end of their resources: they lock up '*findor*' between inverted commas, leaving 'ut . . . credas' with nothing to depend on, and they make their young man explain to those around him, for fear it should escape their notice, that he is splitting his sides with rage. This however is felt to be a trifle too much, and there is some anxiety: Heinrich goes back to the *finditur* of late MSS and old editions, and others would follow him if they dared: 'ego non ausus sum lectionem deserere tot tantisque auctoribus firmatam, quae quamquam potest explicari, quibus incommodis laboret, non me fugit' Jahn, 'etsi illud *findor* (prima persona) mira uidetur exclamatio adolescentis irati (nam aliter res se habet apud Hor. *Sat.* I 3 136, ubi poeta Stoico cuidam indignanti ingerit "rumperis et latras"), tamen nihil mutare ausim' van Wageningen. But the only thing that wants changing is a preconceived opinion.

This satire, throughout its first 62 verses, is aimed at those who live amiss though they know the right way; and the satirist takes himself as a

specimen of the class. Persius is both the subject and the speaker, and no other person has a word to say except the 'unus comitum' who utters verses 5 and 6, 'en quid . . . ulmo est.' But Persius holds parley with himself: first it is the whole man who speaks, *stertimus, findor, querimur, uenimus*; ere long his higher nature mounts the pulpit and thence rebukes him in the second person, 18 *poscis* and *recusas*, 20 *succinis* and *effiuis* and *tibi*, using the first person of itself, 30 *ego* and *nowi*; at 19 the lower nature finds a voice and says *studeam*. In 44 sqq. the reminiscent portion of the mind begins to talk, *memini, tangebam, nollem*; and then in 52 sqq. it takes to task the Persius of to-day, *tibi, stertis, uiuis*. The truth might have been discovered from verses 10-22 alone; for these are a plain imitation of Hor. *serm.* II 3 1-16, satire on the satirist's self.

This part of the essay ends with verse 62. Modern editors make division where division is far less necessary, but print 62 and 63 sqq. as if there were no break between them: this depravation is due to Hermann, before whose time, as in Casaubon's edition and Jahn's of 1843, verse 63 rightly began a new paragraph. From that point onward, in 63-118, the theme is no longer those who sin against light and knowledge, but those who sit in darkness unilluminated by philosophy. Persius gives fair warning of the change of subject: he turns from himself to the public with the plurals 64 *occurrite*, 66 *discite* and *cognoscite* and *o miseri* (the subjunctive *uideas* in 64 is indefinite, as usual, 'one sees'); then, in the singulars 71 *te*, 72 *es*, he selects an individual from the crowd; and this individual, in 74-6, takes definite shape before his mind's eye as a successful lawyer.

One note upon a point of detail. The verses 13 sq. were correctly explained by Buecheler in his edition of 1893, 'id est si uanescit, querimur'; but he had no more notion of punctuating than a housemaid, and when he tried to express this construction in print the result was 'umor. | nigra sed infusa uanescit sepia lympha: | dilutas' etc. Mr Leo has cancelled Buecheler's note but has retained this illiterate and unintelligible punctuation: it should be

tunc querimur crassus calamo quod pendeat umor;  
nigra, sed, infusa uanescit sepia lympha,  
dilutas querimur gemit quod fistula guttas.

Of course the *uanescat* of AB is equally good or even better.

#### V 41-51.

tecum etenim longos memini consumere soles  
et tecum primas epulis decerpere noctes.  
unum opus, et requiem pariter disponimus ambo  
atque uerecunda laxamus seria mensa.  
non equidem hoc dubites, amborum foedere certo  
consentire dies et ab uno sidere duci.  
nostra uel aequali suspendit tempora Libra

Parca tenax ueri, seu nata fidelibus hora  
 diuidit in Geminos concordia fata duorum  
 Saturnumque grauem nostro Ioue frangimus una  
 nescioquod certe est quod me tibi temperat astrum.

50

'sensus ab Horatio tractus' says the scholiast; and it is clear that not only the sense but much of the language is suggested by *carm.* II 17 15-24 'sic potenti | Iustitiae placitumque *Parcis*. | seu *Libra* seu me Scorpios adspicit | formidolosus, pars uiolentior | natalis *horae*, seu tyrannus | Hesperiae Capricornus undae, | utrumque nostrum incredibili modo | *consentit astrum*, te *Iouis* inpio | tutela *Saturno* refulgens | eripuit.' But Persius must have felt that here at any rate was a field in which he could excel his model. There was little star-gazing in Epicurus' sty; but the Stoics, enamoured of divinity and not much attached to truth, had been carried away captive by the daughter of Babylon; and many of the hours which Persius and Cornutus devoted to common study were spent in acquiring Mesopotamian misinformation about celestial objects. The editors explain the young astrologer vaguely, but his words are capable of precise interpretation.

Cornutus and Persius, it appears, were accustomed to map out their time on the same plan and to share their hours of study and of recreation. Ask an astrologer how his science accounts for this phenomenon, and he will answer 'Most likely Cornutus and Persius have the same *χρονοκράτωρ*.' This term has various meanings, some of which do not now concern us; Persius may have followed either of the two systems set forth by Manilius in III 510 sqq. and 537 sqq., or the third which is to be found in Paul. Alex. fol. Q ed. 1586; but I take the second because it is the simplest. The *ώροσκόπος*, the sign of the zodiac which is rising at the moment of birth, presides over the first year of a child's life, the next sign over the second, and so on till the child is twelve years old and the zodiac exhausted; then the first sign presides over his thirteenth year and the wheel goes round again. And not the years only but the months and days and hours of life are severally allotted in the same order to the same twelve signs, beginning from the *ώροσκόπος*, which in this system does duty as *χρονοκράτωρ* for all divisions of time. The words *dies* in 46 and *tempora* in 47 are no mere synonyms for *uitam* but have their proper force; 'ab uno sidere duci' explains itself; and 'Parca suspendit nostra tempora *Libra*' means 'in both of our genitures the *χρονοκράτωρ* was the Balance.' *Libra* is the sign selected, partly because Horace had mentioned it, partly because it has 'duas aequato examine lances' and might therefore be supposed especially favourable to agreement.

Now I must pause for a moment to consider the structure of the sentence, which is usually printed with a strong stop at the end of u. 50. Casaubon and Jahn say nothing about it; Mr Bieger, *de Pers. cod. Pith.* pp. 3 sq., defends the use of *uel* . . . *seu* for *uel* . . . *uel* by quoting passages where *seu* . . . *uel* is used for *seu* . . . *seu*, and subsequent editors mostly copy him; Buecheler

still more irrelevantly quotes Prop. III 21 25, where *uel* is answered by *aut*. It is possible to cite better parallels than these, though not from very good authorities: Vitr. V 6 8 'cum *aut* fabularum mutationes sunt futurae seu deorum aduentus cum tonitribus repentinis,' Tac. *dial.* 5 'incessere *uel* in iudicio *sive* in senatu *sive* apud principem.' But the necessity of imputing this rare and dubious irregularity to Persius arises from the punctuation of the editors, not from the words of the MSS, which, if otherwise divided, are perfectly grammatical. The particle *seu* or *sive* must often be resolved into *uel* *si*, with the *uel* in one clause and the *si* in another. Ter. *And.* 190 'postulo *sive* aequomst te oro,' i.e. postulo *uel*, *si* aequomst, te oro; Hor. *serm.* II 1 59 'Romae seu fors ita iusserit exul,' i.e. Romae *uel*, *si* fors iusserit, exul; Prop. III 21 7 sq. 'bis tamen aut semel admittit, cum saepe negarit, | *seu* uenit extremo dormit amicta toro,' i.e. *uel*, *si* uenit, dormit; Ovid. *her.* X 96 sq. 'destituor ravidis praeda cibusque feris. | *sive* colunt habitantque uiri diffidimus illis,' i.e. *uel*, *si* colunt, diffidimus; finally Pers. I 65-8 'scit tendere uersum | non secus ac si oculo rubricam derigat uno. | *sive* opus in mores, in luxum, in prandia regum | dicere res grandes nostro dat Musa poetae,' i.e. *uel*, *si* opus in mores dicere, res grandes dat Musa. Let *seu* be thus treated in V 48, and the construction will be 'uel aequali Libra Parca nostra tempora suspendit, *uel*, *si* hora in Geminis fata duorum diuidit Saturnumque Ioue frangimus una, certe nescioquod astrum est quod me tibi temperat'; which means 'either we both have Libra for our chronocrator, or, if, instead of that, we both have Gemini for our horoscope and Jupiter so placed in our geniture as to vanquish Saturn, anyhow there is some heavenly body or other which unites us.'

So now for details of interpretation. The exact purport of 48 sq. 'nata . . . duorum,' 'the hour which dawned upon the faithful pair distributes between the Twins the accordant destinies of us twain,' is that Persius and Cornutus were both born when the sign of Gemini was rising in the east, but one of them when Castor, the other when Pollux was rising: this might be supposed to engender in them a unanimity like that of the sons of Leda.<sup>1</sup> I do not think it would be correct to say that *hora* is here used for *horoscopus*,<sup>2</sup> as it is in Sen. *apocol.* 3: it is rather the whole phrase *nata fidelibus hora* which conveys that notion, just as in Horace it is *natalis horae*, not *horae* alone, which signifies *geniturae*, *θέρματος*.

In u. 50 *nostro* of course means *propitio*, as Casaubon says, and not, as Jahn, *communi*, which would add nothing to *una*: see Sil. XII 193 'dexter deus,

<sup>1</sup> The scholiast promptly says 'sub Geminis nati in amicitia permanent, ut et ipsi concordissimi fratres sunt,' but I suspect that this is merely a plausible fancy of Persius' own, for I do not find in the astrologers that two men born under Gemini were likely to be better friends than if they had any other sign for their common horoscope. Casaubon cited Manil. II 631 'magnum erit Geminis amor et concordia duplex,' and the editors of Persius cite it still; but they might

know, what Casaubon could not, that this verse is found in none of Manilius' MSS. What Manilius himself says in that passage is that men born under Gemini are friends with men born under Libra and Aquarius, not that they are friends with one another.

<sup>2</sup> Casaubon says this, but he does not mean it; he talks as laymen do, confusing the horoscope or ascendant with the whole nativity or geniture.

horaque  
the plan  
position  
C. C. A.  
κρᾶσι  
δεσμοῖς

'Th  
and thei  
have left  
tions ab  
sleeve, v  
Casaubo  
Wagenin  
partem  
and the  
qui uitis  
Hor. ser  
'quae |  
nearest  
lasciato  
to choos  
uitam rel  
the word

Thur  
relictam,  
mended  
received  
a false a  
he bring  
to constr  
facillime  
iuges atq  
uerbum  
is qui sc  
relicta.  
Mr Bieg  
trouble a  
intabesc  
scholars



horaque nostra est.' The sense is that in the genitures of Persius and Cornutus the planets Jupiter and Saturn had the same relative positions, and such positions that the benignant Jupiter counteracted the maleficent Saturn. C. C. A. G. V iii pp. 100 sq. ὁ Ζεὺς ἐὰν ὁρᾷ κακοποιὸν ἀστέρα μεταβάλλει τὴν κρᾶσιν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀγαθόν . . . ὁ Ζεὺς ἀναλύνει τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κρόνου δεσμούμενα καὶ μεταβάλλει τὴν κακίαν αὐτοῦ, ὅτε συσχηματίζεται αὐτῷ.

## V 60, 61.

tunc crassos transisse dies lucemque palustrem  
et sibi iam seri uitam ingemuere relictam.

'Then, too late, they mourn that their days have gone by in grossness and their sunshine in mist of the marish, and that life is a thing which they have left untouched.' I translate, because some editors give explicit misdirections about construing the sentence ('sibi with *ingemuere*' Conington, Gildersleeve, van Wageningen) or about interpreting the words (*relictam* 'anteactam' Casaubon, 'their past life' Conington, 'quam post se a tergo habent' van Wageningen, 'se iam ad finem uitae peruenisse et maiorem melioremque uitae partem perdidisse' Némethy). The construction is *sibi uitam relictam (esse)*, and the sense is *se uitam non attigisse, se uita abstinuisse*: 'tamquam non uiuant qui uitis semper indulgent' as the scholiast says. For this use of *relinquo* see Hor. *serm.* II 6 89 'esset ador loliumque, dapis meliora *relinquens*,' *art.* 150 'quae | desperat tractata nitescere posse *relinquit*.' Mr Ramorino comes nearest to the truth with 'troppo tardi si lamentano *se reliquisse uitam*, di aver lasciato passare la vita senza viverla davvero,' though it would have been better to choose some other phrase than 'aver lasciato passare'; Jahn, who renders *uitam relictam* 'cuius nullos fructus habeant,' probably understood the sense of the word but apparently mistook its construction.

Thus much I have written in explanation of the usual reading *uitam . . . relictam*, which is that of A B. But P has *uita . . . relictā*, which was commended by Mr Bieger in 1890 and, though rejected by Buecheler, is now received by Mr Leo. Mr Bieger, p. 35, first sets up, in order to pull it down, a false and purely fictitious interpretation, which he ascribes to Jahn, and then he brings against the reading of A B the singular objection that it is possible to construe it correctly: 'antecedentibus illis u. 60 accusatiuis cum infinitiui facillime inducaris, si legeris u. 61, ut etiam huius uerba pari iugo cum illis iuges atque accipias pro accusatiuo cum infinitiui, cui supplendum sit tantum uerbum substantiuum. quem in errorem' (he continues) 'minime delabatur is qui scripta uiderit uerba codicis C (=P) *et sibi iam seri uita ingemuere relictā*.' Very true indeed: and how are these words to be construed? Mr Bieger only adduces examples of the ablative, as if anyone were in trouble about that. Yet Mr Leo adduces more: III 38 'uirtutem uideant intabescantque relictā,' IV 31 'farrata pueris plaudentibus olla.' What these scholars ought to be explaining to us is the conjunction *et*. With the reading

of A B this joins *transisse dies lucemque uita relicta(m esse)*: with the reading of P the construction must be 'ingemuere transisse dies lucemque et ingemuere uita relicta,' so that *ingemo* has an object in the one clause but is used absolutely in the other. This of course is no impossibility, but it renders the reading of P inferior, and it is what the advocates of that reading ought to defend; and they ought further to ask themselves why they prefer a reading which has need of defence to a reading which has not.

## V 64-69.

petite hinc puerique sènesque  
finem animo certum miserisque uiatica canis.  
'cras hoc fiet.' idem cras fiet. 'quid? quasi magnum  
nempe diem donas!' sed, cum lux altera uenit,  
iam cras hesternum consumpsimus; ecce aliud cras  
egerit hos annos et semper paulum erit ultra.

65

'So I will, to-morrow.' To-morrow will tell the same tale as to-day. 'What? do you mean to call a day a great present to make a man?' Conington.

This is one of those places where it is no use asking questions of Casaubon. There has flitted across his earthly path a heavenly vision, the sentiment afterwards embalmed in Young's verse *Procrastination is the thief of Time*; and his soul has spread her Genevan wings and soared away in pursuit to regions where exact thought is not required of her. The explanation and recension of Persius are abandoned to the children of this world: Casaubon is chasing a moral maxim through Epictetus and Gregory Nazianzen, through Marcus Antoninus and Solomon king of the Jews, to its primal abode in the bosom of Eternal Wisdom. But among the other commentators there is some uneasiness, and well there may be. It makes little difference how the sentence 'quid . . . donas' is punctuated ('quid? quasi magnum | nempe, diem donas' Heinrich, 'quid, quasi magnum, | nempe diem, donas?' Jahn in 1843): its general sense is given by the scholiast, 'quasi aliquid magnum concedis, si unius diei spatio otiosus sim.' Now in the preceding words 'idem cras fiet' there has been no *concessio*, no *donatio diei*; nothing but a prophecy, without a word of permission or indulgence. This is the difficulty which makes commentators mistranslate *donas*, 'do you mean to higgie about a day?' or shun translating it, 'unus dies tibi longa dilatio esse uidetur,' 'unum diem aliquid magni putas.'

*idem cras fiet*, the cause of the trouble, is the reading of all editions but not of all MSS. The reading of A B is this:

'cras hoc fiet.' idem cras fia t. 'quid? quasi magnum  
nempe diem donas!'

There you have the concession to which *donas* refers. 'The new life shall begin to-morrow' says the sluggard. 'No no, let the old life continue

to-morro  
begin th  
soon: t  
reformin  
Therefo  
makes t  
think or

Ex  
must be  
parallel

So  
Plautus  
libertat  
Velina  
Tr

So Buc  
They c  
but no  
No  
either J  
words  
start.  
the pas  
imagin

That i  
posside  
Publius  
is said  
lictors  
and to

to-morrow' answers Persius; 'the day after to-morrow will be soon enough to begin the new.' The day after to-morrow, he well knows, will be much too soon: the sluggard, when he said '*cras hoc fiet*,' had no genuine intention of reforming himself either the next day or the next month or the next year. Therefore this ironical indulgence, implying as it does '*perendie hoc fiat*,' makes the sluggard very angry; he sees that he is caught. 'You seem to think one day's grace a large concession!'

Experience has taught me what to expect. *fiet* is in P, and therefore must be right; and we shall hear that it is placed beyond doubt by the parallel of Ouid. *rem.* 104 '*dicimus assidue "cras quoque fiet idem."*'

## V 73-76.

libertate opus est, non hac, ut, quisque Velina  
Publius emeruit, scabiosum tesserula far  
possidet. heu steriles ueri, quibus una Quiritem  
uertigo facit.

So Jahn and Hermann: *quisque* is to mean *quicumque*, as if Persius were Plautus or. Cyprian, and *ut*, whether it can or no, is to mean *qua*: 'non hac libertate opus est, qua scabiosum far tesserula possidet, quicumque Publius Velina emeruit.' No need of any more liberty for these editors.

Try again.

libertate opus est. non hac, ut quisque Velina  
Publius: emeruit, scabiosum tesserula far  
possidet.

So Buecheler, followed by his usual retinue, the Publil of the Veline tribe. They cannot construe their patron's text, and some of them confess as much, but no matter: Buechelerus dixit, ita est.

Now any interpretation which treats the three words *ut quisque emeruit* as either Jahn or Buecheler treated them is necessarily futile: that these three words are a single clause is the one certainty from which enquiry must take its start. Casaubon construed them rightly, and came near to clearing the the passage up; but he made *hac* depend on *opus est* and inserted after it an imaginary *qua*. The difficulty was finally removed by Conington.

libertate opus est. non hac, ut quisque Velina  
Publius emeruit, scabiosum tesserula far  
possidet.

That is 'non hac libertate serui, simul atque emeruerunt, far tesserula possident,' 'non haec, quam ego dico, libertas, sed longe alia, ut quisque Publius Velina emeruit, dat ei ius farris tesserula adipiscendi': the same thing is said again in 174 sq. 'hic, hic, quod quaerimus, hic est, | non in festuca, lictor quam iactat ineptus.' Yet this punctuation has never been adopted, and to all appearance never will be, in any edition published outside England.

One editor, to show that he has not read Conington's note, objects that the double ablative is harsh. Suppose it were: against what other interpretation is there so little as that to be said?

## V 109-112.

es modicus uoti, presso lare, dulcis amicis?  
iam nunc adstringas, iam nunc granaria laxes, 110  
inque luto fixum possis transcendere nummum  
nec gluttu sorbere saliuam Mercurialem?

Mr Leo makes a great to-do about uu. 110 sq., and in *Hermes* XLV p. 43 he puts them first and foremost among the passages which have converted him from Buecheler's belief in the integrity of Persius' text: 'in den Versen V 104 ff. . . sind die Coniunctive *adstringas* . . . *laxes* . . . *possis* unverstündlich.' The subjunctive of *possum* is so common where the indicative would suffice (e.g. Hor. *serm.* I 3 30 'rideri possit') that *possis* at any rate should have been left out of the question. But in *adstringas* and *laxes* the subjunctive mood is not only intelligible but necessary; the indicative would be wrong. To have said 'iam nunc *adstringis*, iam nunc granaria *laxas*?' would have implied that the person addressed was the possessor of *granaria*. But the person addressed is any student of philosophy, and *granaria* were possessed only by farmers, by rich men, or by the state: 'cur tua plus laudes cumeris granaria nostris?' says Horace to the miser in *serm.* I 1 53. Persius is asking 'granaria modo *adstringas*, modo *laxes*, si sint tibi granaria?' 'if you had stores of corn, would you spare and spend them seasonably? if you saw a coin in the gutter, could you pass on without longing to pick it up?'

## V 134-137.

'et quid agam?' 'rogat? en saperdas aduehe Ponto,  
castoreum, stuppas, hebenum, tus, lubrica Coa; 135  
tolle recens primus piper et sitiente camelo;  
uerte aliquid; iura.'

For *et* in 136 some editors print *e*, others *ex* (which certain scholars regard as less of a change), others *ec*; and the construction is generally taken to be 'tolle *e* camelo.' Spell it as you will, the preposition is not natural: the camel carried the pepper on his back, not in any of his numerous stomachs; and it does not follow that we ought to say 'tollere piper *e* camelo' because there exist such phrases as 'desilire ex equo.' The scholiast has '*recens*, nuper de camelo depositum': it would be rash to infer that he read and construed '*recens* . . . *a* sitiente camelo,' but that would be better than *e*.

The *et* of the MSS has been very ill used, for it is good grammar and good sense. Since the adjective *primus* and the abl. abs. *sitiente camelo* are both of them adverbial adjuncts to the predicate, and therefore parallel in force though not in form, they are quite correctly united by the conjunction. It

would  
'extrem  
explora  
IV 6 r  
joined

TH  
the cla  
has bee  
chap.  
associa  
indeed  
sitions  
with t  
conuale  
force, o  
the for  
IV 1  
the int  
no me  
Proper  
im  
by its s

That '  
things  
Hor. ca  
frigus  
calido  
solem  
'umida  
ager,'  
temper  
confusi  
ago, in

TH  
tators

would be easy to collect many examples such as this or Verg. *Aen.* V 498 'extremus galeaque ima subsedit Acestes' or Ouid. *met.* V 362 sq. 'postquam exploratum satis est, loca nulla labare, | depositoque metu' or Cic. *ad fam.* IV 6 1 'clarum uirum et magnis rebus gestis.' *tuum* and *trabeate* are similarly joined by *uel* in Pers. III 29.

## VI 6-8.

mihi nunc Ligus ora  
intepet hibernatque meum mare, qua latus ingens  
dant scopuli et multa litus se ualle receptat.

The student of Latin leads a distracted life between the scholars who edit the classics of that tongue and the scholars who compile its grammars. He has been reading, let us suppose, Mr Lindsay's *Latin Language*, and there in chap. VIII § 28 he has met this sentence: 'The suffix (-sco) is closely associated with Intransitive Verbs of the second Conjugation, so closely indeed that these, when compounded with the Prepositions *cum*, *ex*, *in* (Prepositions which convey the idea of "becoming"), always form their Present-stem with this suffix in good authors, e.g. *erubescō* (not *erubeo*), *conualescō* (not *conualeo*), *inardescō* (not *inardeo*), unless the Preposition retains its separate force, e.g. *e-luceo*, "to shine out," *co-haereo*, "to be united with," which have the force of *luceo ex*, *haereo cum*.' Then in editions of Propertius he finds IV 1 124 'lacus aestiuus intepet Vmber aquis,' and in editions of Persius the *intepet* transcribed above, and he finds them accompanied by no defence, no mention even, of the falseness of the form. Apparently Persius and Propertius are not 'good authors.'

*intepet* in Prop. IV 1 124, apart from all question of grammar, is condemned by its sense.

qua nebulosa cauo rorat Mevania campo  
et lacus aestiuus intepet Vmber aquis.

That 'the waters of the Umbrian mere grow warm in summer' is one of those things which no poet ever says. Either he is silent, or he says the contrary: Hor. *carm.* III 13 9-12 'te flagrantis atrox hora Caniculae | nescit tangere, tu frigus amabile | fessis uomere tauris | praebes,' Stat. *silv.* I 3 5-8 'illum nec calido latrauit Sirius astro . . . . . talis hiemps tectis, frangunt sic improba solem | frigora, Pisaemque domus non aestuat annum,' Mart. V 71 1 sq. 'umida qua gelidas summittit Trebula ualles | et uiridis Cancr mensibus alget ager,' Claud. *rapt. Pros.* II 105 sq. 'siluaque torrentes ramorum frigore soles | temperat et medio brumam sibi uindicat aestu.' Accordingly, since the confusion of *n̄* with *in* is easy and common, I proposed a quarter of a century ago, in the *Journal of Philology* XVI p. 34, to write

et lacus aestiuus non tepet Vmber aquis.

The dictionaries quote from Stat. *Theb.* II 376 sq. what some commentators on Persius and Propertius suppose to be a third example of the same

verb: 'qua Lerna palus, ambustaque sontibus alte | *intepet* hydra uadis.' But there the preposition has its local force: *intepet uadis* is *tepet in uadis*, like Hor. *epod.* 11 15 'meis inaequet praecordiis' or Sil. XIV 435 'ambusto intridens pelago.' I know only one more place in classical Latin where the rule is violated in a compound of *in*; and there again the anomaly receives no notice from the commentators: Liu. VIII 8 10 'triarii sub uexillis considerant, sinistro crure porrecto, scuta innixa umeris, hastas subrecta cuspidem in terra fixas, haud secus quam uallo saepa *inhorret* acies, tenentes.' Here, as in Propertius, there is a second stumbling-block: a construction, *haud secus quam inhorret* with the omission of *si*, to which no parallel is adduced from Livy. Both irregularities can be removed by the easy change of *in* to *ut*, 'haud secus quam uallo saepa *ut horret* acies,' that is 'ut acies, haud secus quam uallo saepa, horret.' There you have Livy's construction of *haud secus quam* (e.g. § 12 of the next chapter 'haud secus quam pestifero sidere icti') and Livy's trick of postponing the introductory particle (e.g. XXII 1 16 'cetera, cum decemviri libros inspexissent, *ut ita fierent*').

All other breaches of the rule, so far as I can ascertain, are found in authors of small authority: *inalbeo* Appuleius, *inferueo* Cato Celsus Columella, *inualeo* Ammianus. *instupente* (i.e. *istupente*) in Plin. *n.h.* XXVIII 38 is only a false variant for *stupente*; Non. p. 110 (s. u. *flaccet*) 'Ennius Thyeste, *inflaccet* condiciones, repudiato et reddito' has long been corrected to *sin flaccet*; and in *illuceo* the *in* is local.

But Mr Lindsay, himself an editor as well as a grammarian, would be grieved if anyone took his rule so seriously as to alter a letter of Persius' text in deference to it. The place for grammar is in grammars; when it comes to editing, tradition is the brazen pot and grammar the earthen. And in fact the rule, in its present form, is not strictly true. It has descended, probably through several stages, from Lachmann's note on Lucr. II 301, gathering confidence on its way: Lachmann spoke less decidedly, 'Marullus uix Latine *inque ualebunt*: nam quae praepositiones auctum et incrementum significant, ut *con e in re*, eae *ualescendi* uerbo aptae sunt, non *ualendi*.' So far as my observation goes, the rule holds good of *e*: in *effulgeo* *eniteo* *extumeo* the preposition has its local force, and *exardeo* and *excandeo* are found in no decent author; only it is worth mentioning that Columella, even in his tenth book, where he is on his best behaviour, ventures to use *exhorreat* at u. 154. But for *con* the rule must be somewhat relaxed. I do not speak of *condoleo*; for the *thes. ling. Lat.* deceives its readers when it says that Cicero employed this verb, and cites *ad. Att.* XV 4 1 in a mutilated form which conceals the truth about the text. Nor need we fret ourselves over *commarceo* in Ammianus or *conferueo* in Palladius or even *concaleo* in Plautus. But Persius' respectable contemporary Calpurnius in *buc.* IV 97 sq. writes 'aspicis ut uirides audito Caesare siluae | *conticeant*,' and *colluceo* is used by the best authors, by Cicero and Virgil, in places where it is hard to find a local sense in the preposition.

If therefore the grammatical anomaly of *intepet* were the only difficulty

in Per  
anoma  
it has  
The s  
two s  
of h  
παπα  
quote  
'saeu  
that  
thoug  
quart  
consi  
seems  
hibern  
metre

Plin.  
sempe  
tua  
uerna  
despu  
'sua  
comm  
The  
183  
presen

T  
left  
'serve  
from  
Rome  
can b  
poore  
wozu

in Pers. VI 7, I should be disposed, though doubtfully, to admit these cognate anomalies as a defence. But, like *intepet* in Propertius and *inhorreret* in Livy, it has another difficulty bound up with it. What is the meaning of *hibernat*? The scholiast says 'saeuit, uel a nauigiis uacat.' *hiemare* has the first of these two senses, but the learning of a Casaubon and a Jahn can adduce no example of *hibernare* with either. This verb is regularly explained in the glossaries by *παραχειμάζειν*, 'to spend the winter'; and that is its meaning in every passage quoted in the lexicons. Moreover 'a nauigiis uacat' is not relevant, and 'saeuit' can only be rendered so by supposing an allusion to the theory that 'maria agitata uentis . . . tepescunt,' Cic. n. d. II 26. I have sometimes thought that perhaps the sea is fancifully said to have 'gone into winter quarters' in the sheltered bay, 'qua latus ingens dant scopuli'; but when one considers that the sea remained in the same spot all the year round, this seems foolish as well as artificial. I therefore suspect that the words *intepet hibernatque* are an attempt, and no very successful attempt, to make sense and metre and grammar of *mitetpetbernatque*; that is

mihi nunc Ligus ora

mitetpet uernatque meum mare.

Plin. n. h. II 136 'in Italia . . . mobilior aer mitiore hieme et aestate nimbose semper quodam modo uernat uel autumnat,' Plin. ep. I 31 'quid agit Comum, tuae meaeque deliciae? quid suburbanum amoenissimum? quid illa porticus uerna semper?' For *mitetpet* see III 110 'subrisit molle,' IV 34 sq. 'acre | despuat,' V 190 'crassum ridet,' Verg. buc. III 63 (IV 43, cop. 19, cir. 96) 'suaue rubens,' Stat. silu. II 2 137 'iuuenile calens,' Theb. XII 248 'grauē comminus aestuat aer,' Sen. ep. 115 4 'oculis mite quiddam . . . flagrantibus.' The vice of haplography, frequent in AB (V 87 e<t u>t u<ol> tolle, 183 n<at>at, VI 43 o b<on>e, 58 dicam <am>, 74 oment<o p>opa), was present even in the archetype, I 111 omnes <omnes>, II 19 cuinam <cuinam>.

#### VI 37-40.

'tunc bona incolumis minuas?' et, Bestius, arguet  
doctores Graios: 'ita fit; postquam sapere urbi  
cum pipere et palmis uenit nostrum hoc maris expers,  
faeniscae crasso uitiarunt unguine pultes.'

40

The heir is angry that the deceased has spent so much upon himself and left so little behind him. He therefore inters him with a shabby funeral: 'serve you right' says he, and inveighs in Bestius' vein against professors from Greece: 'since this precious philosophy that now afflicts us came to Rome, even hedgers and ditchers have taken to such coarse luxuries as they can buy'; everyone, down to the lowest, makes fatter cheer and dies the poorer. Heinrich rightly explains 'das eigentliche Subject zu *urget* ist *heres*, wozu *Bestius* Apposition ist, ut alter Bestius': the name has the same



construction in the sentence of Horace from which Persius has borrowed it, *epist.* I 15 37.

Another imitation of Horace, in the words *maris experts*, has given more trouble. Everyone would like to translate *sapere maris experts* as Casaubon does, *sapientia ἀπείρος οὐδὲν ἔχουσα*. But this is forbidden by the universal belief that Horace in *serm.* II 8 15 used the phrase *Chium maris experts*, and by the belief, almost universal, that *maris* in this phrase is the genitive of *mare*. '*sapere hoc nostrum*, huius seculi et generis (I 9, II 62),' says Jahn, 'obscure uocat *maris experts*, ut mihi quidem uidetur, Horatii locum respiciens (*sat.* II 8 15): *Chium maris experts*. hoc ipsum autem quid sit neitquam est perspicuum.' The *maris experts* of Persius is generally thought to mean 'insulsum,' 'ingenua ui et salubritate destitutum'; and yet it is impossible that this should have been Horace's meaning, for the repast which Nasidienus set before his guests was even oppressive in its choiceness. Other interpretations have still less to recommend them.

The fact is that Horace does not use the phrase *Chium maris experts* at all. His words are these,

procedit fuscus Hydaspes  
Caecuba uina ferens, Alcon Chium maris experts;

and he never dreamt that anyone would try to construe *experts* with *Chium*. His readers were men familiar from their childhood with the habits of Latin poetry, and when in the first of these two clauses they saw *Hydaspes* with an epithet and *Caecuba uina* with none, they inferred as a matter of course that the epithet in the second clause belonged not to *Chium* but to *Alcon*. *Hydaspes* was a blackamoor, *Alcon* a eunuch: *maris experts* means *cuiratus*. These two types are again found side by side among the 'famulae numerus turbae populusque minister' in Luc. X 131-4 'pars sanguinis usti | torta caput refugosque gerens a fronte capillos, | nec non infelix ferro mollita iuuentus | atque exsecta uirum': add Sen. *dial.* I 3 13 'illis quibus gemma ministratur, quibus exoletus omnia pati doctus exsectae uirilitalis aut dubiae suspensam auro niuem diluit.' It is no obstacle to this interpretation that *marum experts* has a very different sense in Suet. *Claud.* 33 2 'libidinis in feminas profusissimae, marum omnino experts'; for Madvig at Cic. *de fin.* II 64 and I myself at Manil. II 617 have given many examples of the diverse meanings which may be conveyed by one and the same form of words, and here I will add another which is particularly apposite. *odisse uiros* is used in its most obvious sense by Virgil *Aen.* II 158 'fas odisse uiros'; but *odisse uirum* in Manil. V 151 means *odisse uirilitalatem*, 'pumicibusque cauis horrentia membra polire | atque odisse uirum teritisque optare lacertos.' Persius understood Horace as Horace expected to be understood, and here imitates him by using *maris experts* for 'unmanly.' Compare I 103 sq. 'haec fierent, si testiculi uena ulla paterni | uiueret in nobis?'

was  
II p  
ment  
in 10  
In 10

and  
prete  
inste  
sulks  
greed  
nose

many  
them  
the c  
was  
what  
inher  
quoq

1 Th  
on p.  
bac. II



## VI 41-56.

at tu, meus heres

quisquis eris, paulum a turba seductioni audi.  
 o bone, num ignoras? missa est a Caesare laurus  
 insignem ob cladem Germanae pubis et aris  
 frigidus excutitur cinis ac iam postibus arma, 45  
 iam chlamydas regum, iam lutea gausapa captis  
 essedaque ingentesque locat Caesonia Rhēnos.  
 dis igitur genioque ducis centum paria ob res  
 egregie gestas induco. quis uetat? aude.  
 uae, nisi coniues. oleum artocreasque popello 50  
 largior. an prohibes? dic clare. 'non adeo' inquis  
 'exossatus ager iuxta est.' age, si mihi nulla  
 iam reliqua ex amitis, patruelis nulla, proneptis  
 nulla manet patrui, sterilis matertera uixit  
 deque auia nihilum superest, accedo Bouillas 55  
 cliumque ad Virbi, praesto est mihi Manius heres.

The interpretation of verses 51 and 52 which this punctuation indicates was proposed by K. F. Hermann seventy years ago in his *lectiones Persianae* II pp. 62-5. From Hermann it was adopted, like so many other improvements, by Jahn in 1868, from Jahn by Buecheler in 1886, and from Buecheler in 1901 by the *thes. ling. Lat.* vol. I p. 612 l. 27 under *ADEO aduerbium*.<sup>1</sup> In 1910 Mr Leo brought back the old division

'non adeo' inquis?

exossatus ager iuxta est: age, si . . .

and resuscitated one of the old—explanations I cannot call them, but derisory pretences of explanation. The greedy heir (for that is the type depicted), instead of answering the question asked him, is supposed to fly into a fit of sulks and say 'non adeo (hereditatem)'; as if it were characteristic of a greedy heir to profess that no bread is better than half a loaf, and cut off his nose to spite his face.

When any attentive student reads this passage for the first time, he asks many questions. 42 *paulum a turba seductioni*: what has the crowd to do with them? why must they converse just out of earshot of the crowd? Because the crowd hates philosophy, says Casaubon. That shows the straits Casaubon was in, for there is no philosophy in this conversation. 50 *uae, nisi coniues*: what direful consequence will ensue? will Persius assault his heir? or disinherit him? or tell Caligula? 'liberalius etiam agam et praeter ludos oleum quoque et artocreas popello largior' says Jahn. *largiar*, I presume; and that is

<sup>1</sup> The passage however ought not to stand in section I C 1, with *Aem. I 567* 'non obtusa adeo gestamus pectora Poeni.' on p. 612 in section I C 5 along with Verg. *buc. II 25* 'nec sum adeo informis,' but on p. 606.

the lection of AB; but the *largior* of P is supported by Priscian and read by Jahn himself. 51 *dic clare*: why is he to speak out loud? is Persius hard of hearing? 52 *exossatus ager iuxta est*: why *exossatus*? and why *iuxta*? Persius is maintaining his right to dispose of his property as he thinks fit: what difference does it make whether that property is *iuxta* or *longe*, *exossatus* or *lipidosus*? An explanation which leaves all these matters unexplained is not what I call an explanation but what I call an insult.

Now, by way of contrast, listen to Hermann. The heir is aggrieved that Persius should diminish, by generosity to a friend in need of it, the inheritance he will leave behind him. Persius, who holds that a man may do as he will with his own, thereupon defies the heir to check him even in a much less justifiable extravagance. 'Step here,' says he, 'a little apart from the crowd, but only a little. There is great news from Germany, a battle won and a triumph in prospect; and I propose, in honour of the event, to exhibit a hundred pair of gladiators and make a distribution of food to the people. Do you forbid me? Answer, and speak out loud. "There are too many stones on the ground hereabouts" say you.' Is not this bare paraphrase itself enough? Does not everyone see that if the heir raises his voice, and the people overhear him trying to rob them of their gladiators and their free victuals, they will stone him to death unless there are no stones to be had? 'ager iuxta non adeo exossatus est ut audeam clare dicere me prohibere.' Amidst the confused annotations of the scholiast there are relics to show that this explanation is old as well as true: 'ager plenus lapidibus non longe est,' 'plenus lapidibus, secundum eos qui definiunt lapides ossa esse terrae, ut Ovidius in metamorphoseon ait "lapides in corpore terrae ossa reor dici"': the author of these notes joined *exossatus* with the negative. The only point in which I dissent from Hermann is that he, with some other of the commentators, thinks that 'uae, nisi coniuēs' points to the emperor's displeasure, whereas I think that the emperor is outside the picture and the only danger apprehended is from the crowd a few yards away.

Then, with the 'age' of u. 52, used as in Hor. *serm.* II 3 117, Persius takes a step further. Hitherto he has only asserted his right to spend his money as he will without caring how little he may leave to his heir. Now he threatens to leave it to someone else.

## VI 64-69.

'dest aliquid summae.' minui mihi, sed tibi totum est  
quidquid id est. ubi sit, fuge quaerere, quod mihi quondam 65  
legarat Tadius, neu dicta pone paterna,  
faenoris accedat merces, hinc exime sumptus.  
'quid reliquum est?' reliquum? nunc, nunc inpensius ungue,  
ungue, puer, caules.

The scholiast, being no metrist, took the *dicta* of u. 66 for a noun and understood 'neu dicta pone paterna' as 'do not talk to me like a father'; and

edidit  
punctum  
est  
existit  
of in  
soon  
and v  
corre  
rema  
reliqu  
Buec  
reliqu  
princ  
dicta.

'Do  
and se  
more  
ait, |  
illo "

T  
ita an  
tive.  
2nd pe  
IV 46  
hexam  
except  
annum

Ja  
n. h. X.

Inde  
sentence  
the, ling  
cite this

editors down to 1886 printed *repono* or *oppono* with a similar sense. The punctuation of 66 here given is Buecheler's, who explained '*dicta imperatiuus est*' and has of course been followed pell-mell by the subsequent editors. The existing punctuation of 67 and 68,—the full stop at *sumptus* and the fresh pair of inverted commas for *quid reliquum est*,—Buecheler retained, and we shall soon see that he was obliged to retain it. But it was observed by Conington, and when once observed it is evident, that *accedat* and *exime* and *reliquum* are correlatives: the sense is 'add the interest, subtract the outgoings, and what remains?' and the punctuation must therefore be '*exime sumptus, | quid reliquum est?*' Mr Ramorino attempts to combine this punctuation with Buecheler's: *neu dicta 'pone paterna, accedat merces, exime sumptus, quid reliquum est?'* But the enquiry '*quid reliquum est?*', which now becomes the principal part of the quoted sentence, is no *dictatio* and cannot depend on *dicta*.<sup>1</sup> I therefore add one letter:

*neu dic ita, 'pone paterna,  
faenoris accedat merces, hinc exime sumptus,  
quid reliquum est?' reliquum?*

'Do not say "state<sup>2</sup> what you inherited, add interest, subtract expenditure, and see how much is left." Left, quotha!' The meaning 'as follows' is much more commonly conveyed by *sic*, but see Ouid. *fast.* IV 884 sq. '*dux ita* Turnus ait, | "stat mihi non paruo uirtus mea,"' Cic. II *Verr.* i 103 '*ita* dicent, "de illo"' etc.

There is indeed one objection which might be brought equally against *dic ita* and *dicta*: that Persius nowhere else uses either *neu* or *ne* with the imperative. If this were cogent, it would be no great change to write *dicas*; for the 2nd person of verbs is much altered into the 3rd, and in two places, III 78 and IV 46, the *dicat* of P becomes *dicta* in AB. But similarly Horace in his hexameter writings has no example of either *ne* or *neu* with the imperative except a single verse, *epist.* I 11 23 '*grata sume manu neu dulcia differ in annum.*'

## VI 75-80.

*uende animam lucro, mercare atque excute sollers* 75  
*omne latus mundi, ne sit praestantior alter*  
*Cappadocas rigida pinguis plausisse catasta,*  
*rem duplica. 'feci; iam triplex, iam mihi quarto,*  
*iam decies redit in rugam. depunge ubi sistam,*  
*inuentus, Chrysippe, tui finitor acerui.'* 80

Jahn says that *rugam* in 79 means *sinum* or *gremium*, and refers to Plin. n. h. XXXV 56, where it means something else; Heinrich has '*rua* d. i. rugo-

<sup>1</sup> Indeed it is not clear to me that any quoted sentence could depend on that verb; when the *thes. ling. Lat.* arrives at *dicto* it will doubtless cite this example, but I shall be surprised if it

cites another.

<sup>2</sup> So I understand *pone*, with Mr Ramorino; Buecheler took it to mean 'invest.'

sum marsupium, der Geldbeutel'; the one or the other explanation is transmitted by Conington, Gildersleeve, Némethy, and van Wageningen. The word is incapable of either meaning, and neither would be appropriate in speaking of so huge a sum. Yet two scholars, because *rugam* will not bear these interpretations, would change it to *bulgam*.

The true explanation was given by the scholiast and adopted by many of the old editors, including Casaubon, though I can find it in no modern commentary but Mr Ramorino's. '*in rugam*: allegoricos dixit a uestibus, quod ad *rugam* plicentur.' The printer will make all plain:

rem duPLICa. feci; iam triPLEX, iam mihi quarto,  
iam decies redit in RVGAM.

*redit in rugam* means 'is pleated afresh,' i.e. *denuo multiplicatur*. The metaphor latent in the verb *multiplico* is similarly developed by Manilius III 486 sq. 'hunc numerum *reuocabis in ipsum* | *multiplicans deciens*' and IV 496 'quinta (pars) in quinos numeros *reuocata*.'

A. E. HOUSMAN.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

A  
questi  
which  
and n  
the be  
Grund  
Home  
refute  
promu  
A. La  
trover  
myself  
Thätig  
repeat  
and in

T  
groups  
the po  
interpe  
A.  
σχέθι  
νόμον  
ποιητά  
κάλλισ  
the la  
léon II  
the He  
Is  
δόξαν  
βουλη

NO.

## PISISTRATUS AND HOMER.

AN aspect of Pisistratus, which has not hitherto been utilized in this question (see p. 50), appears to justify another presentment of the evidence which connects him with the Homeric tradition. I shall endeavour to be brief and not to repeat what is common property or irrelevant. The literature and the bearing of the controversy are given with his usual clearness by P. Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*,<sup>2</sup> pp. 125 sqq. Cauer's private doctrine, that Homer was for the first time written down by Pisistratus, I consider sufficiently refuted by C. Rothe, *Die Ilias als Dichtung*, pp. 5-13. Fantastic views lately promulgated in England are<sup>1</sup> dealt with conclusively to my mind by Mr. A. Lang, *The World of Homer*, pp. 281 sqq., to whose account nothing for controversial purposes need be added. On looking back over the literature I find myself most in agreement with Hans Flach, whose treatise, *Die litterarische Thätigkeit des Pisistratos*, 1885, has been unduly depreciated. I shall have to repeat my own views expressed in the *Classical Review*, 1901, p. 7; 1907, p. 18; and in the *Classical Quarterly*, 1909, p. 84.

### I.

#### THE AUTHORITIES.

The passages of ancient authors which bear on this question fall into four groups—those dealing with the Panathenaea, those attesting the transport of the poems to Athens, those asserting the collection of the lays, those asserting interpolation.

A. Lycurgus in *Leocr.* p. 102, βούλομαι δ' ὑμῖν καὶ τῶν Ὀμήρου παρασχέσθαι ἔπων. οὕτω γὰρ ὑπέλαβον ὑμῶν οἱ πατέρες σπουδαῖον εἶναι ποιητὴν ὥστε νόμον ἔθεντο καθ' ἑκάστην πεντετηρίδα τῶν Παναθηναίων μόνου τῶν ἄλλων ποιητῶν ραψοδεῖσθαι τὰ ἔπη, ἐπίδειξιν ποιούμενοι πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ὅτι τὰ κάλλιστα τῶν ἔργων προηροῦντο. The festival is named, but not the author of the law. An Athenian orator could hardly glorify Pisistratus, and Napoléon III. is still ignored by the French Republic. The passage implies that the Hesiodic corpus, Eumelus, etc., were excluded from the Panathenaea.

Isocr. *Panegy.* XLII. = 159 οἶμαι δὲ καὶ τὴν Ὀμήρου ποιήσιν μείζω λαβεῖν δόξαν ὅτι καλῶς τοὺς πολεμήσαντας τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐνεκομίασε, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο βουλευθῆναι τοὺς προγόνους ἡμῶν ἐντιμον αὐτοῦ ποιῆσαι τὴν τέχνην ἐν τε τοῖς τῆς

<sup>1</sup> So I wrote; we must now say 'were.'

μουσικῆς ἄθλοις καὶ τῇ παιδεύσει τῶν νεωτέρων ἵνα πολλὰκις ἀκούοντες τῶν ἐπὶν ἐκμανθάνωμεν τὴν ἔχθραν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς καὶ ζηλοῦντες τὰς ἀρετὰς τῶν στρατευσαμένων τῶν αὐτῶν ἔργων ἐκείνοις ἐπιθυμῶμεν. This statement is vaguer than Lycurgus', inasmuch as both festival and legislator are omitted. To follow Isocrates' argument literally the reference would be to the fifth century, not the sixth, if Homer owed his popularity to his coincidence with anti-Persian feeling. Probably Isocrates adapted the tradition to his purpose, and the vagueness is intentional. The first passage in which the Panathenaic regulations are ascribed to anyone in particular is in the Platonic *Hipparchus* 228 B. ΣΩ. οὐ μεντὰν καλῶς ποιοῖν οὐ πειθόμενος ἀνδρὶ ἀγαθῷ καὶ σοφῷ. ΠΙ. τίνι τούτῳ; καὶ τί μάλιστα; ΣΩ. πολίτῃ μὲν ἐμῷ τε καὶ σφ', Πεισιστράτου δὲ νιεί τοῦ ἐκ Φιλαιδῶν, Ἰππάρχῳ, ὃς τῶν Πεισιστράτου παίδων ἦν πρεσβύτατος καὶ σοφώτατος, ὃς ἄλλα τε πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ ἔργα σοφίας ἀπεδείξατο καὶ τὰ Ὀμήρου πρῶτος ἐκόμισεν εἰς τὴν γῆν ταυτηνί, καὶ ἡγάγκασε τοὺς ῥαψωδοὺς Παναθηναίους ἐξ ὑπολήψεως ἐφεξῆς αὐτὰ διέναι, ὥσπερ νῦν ἐτι οἶδε ποιοῦσι. καὶ ἐπ' Ἀνακρέοντα τὸν Τήιον πεντηκοντόρον στείλας ἐκόμισεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν· Σιμωνίδην δὲ τὸν Κεῖον περὶ αὐτὸν αἰεὶ εἶχε, μεγάλους μισθοὺς καὶ δώρους πείθων. No political embargo restrained the philosopher; he celebrated the tyrant's son as the Leone decimo or the Morgan of his day, purchasing treasures and concentrating men of letters. The author of the *Hipparchus* is unknown, but it must belong to the fourth century. The next text rests on the authority of a historian who may belong to the same century (Wilamowitz, *Hom. Untersuch.* 240 sqq.). Diogenes Laert. I. 2, 56 (Life of Solon): τὰ τε Ὀμήρου ἐξ ὑποβολῆς γέγραφε ῥαψωδεῖσθαι, οἷον ὅπου ὁ πρῶτος ἐλῆξεν ἐκείθεν ἄρχεσθαι τὸν ἐχόμενον. μᾶλλον οὖν Σόλων Ὀμηρον ἐφώτισεν ἢ Πεισίστρατος, ὃς φησι Διευχίδας ἐν ἐ' Μεγαρικῶν [*FHG.* IV. 389]. That Dieuchidas preferred the democrat to the tyrant or the tyrant's son follows from his national standpoint, which may be observed elsewhere in his fragments (see p. 50). The account of the regulation, its author apart, is evidently identical in these two sources. Dieuchidas seems to have omitted the festival, not a pleasing subject to a Megarian.

There was then, at the end of the fourth century, a tradition believed in Athens and in Megara by orators philosophers and antiquaries, that Homer was recited at the Panathenaea exclusively and consecutively, under a regulation ascribed to Solon or Pisistratus.

B. The passage from the *Hipparchus* cited above contains the next tradition also: τὰ Ὀμήρου πρῶτος ἐκόμισεν εἰς τὴν γῆν ταυτηνί—a remarkable statement to have been made not more than one hundred and fifty years after the supposed event. That the Homeric poems were previously unknown in Greece is disproved by their diffusion and influence at Sicily under Clisthenes (Herod. V. 67); that they had already arrived at Athens appears from the appeal made to them in the matter of Sigeion (see p. 46). Athenian history is an all but total blank before the affair of Sigeion, and we can make no statement about the early culture of Attica. It is singular that the historical imagination of the later fourth century conceived an epos-less Attica till the

time  
said th  
is gene

T  
ὄψὲ δὲ  
'Ὀμήρου  
ἵστερος  
Dio Pr  
ἀπὸ Κρ  
passed  
this fac  
poems  
Western  
appear  
Πολίτε  
παρὰ τ  
and in  
heirs of  
γάρ τις  
μέρη τι  
other h  
self at  
Dieuch

C.  
to have  
(de Or.  
tempore  
Thalen  
eloquent  
libros co  
ciuibus  
Cicero's  
the link  
Crates.  
starts fr  
(on whi  
VII. 26.  
Δονοῦσσ  
καὶ Ὀμ

<sup>1</sup> It is di  
(ad Att. 1  
Κορυδαίων.  
nickname,  
noticeable

time of the Pisistratidae. Hippostratus, the Sicilian antiquarian (see p. 43), said that Cynaethus first sang Homer in Syracuse, *Ol.* 69; but the statement is generally thought incredible.

The same achievement is ascribed to Lycurgus by Aelian *V.H.* XIII. 14. ὁψὲ δὲ Λυκούργος ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιος ἀθρόαν πρῶτος ἐς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἐκόμισε τὴν Ὀμήρου ποιήσιν· τὸ δὲ ἀγώγιμον τοῦτο ἐξ Ἰωνίας ἡνίκα ἀπεδήμησεν ἤγαγεν. ὕστερον δὲ Πεισίστρατος συναγαγὼν ἀπέφηνε τὴν Ἰλιάδα καὶ Ὀδύσειαν; and Dio Prus. II. 45, ἐπεὶ τοι καὶ φασιν αὐτὸν ἐπαινέτην Ὀμήρου γενέσθαι καὶ πρῶτον ἀπὸ Κρήτης ἢ τῆς Ἰωνίας κομίσαι τὴν ποιήσιν εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα. That Homer passed from East to West is true, and the legend in both its forms contains this fact. It is conceivable that the Homeridae, to explain the passing of the poems from their hands, circulated a legend that they had entrusted them to a Western lawgiver on his travels. This origin of the Lycurgus legend at least appears clearly from the older statement in the excerpts from Heraclides' *Πολίτεια* (*FHG.* II. 210): Λυκούργος ἐν Σάμῳ ἐγένετο καὶ τὴν Ὀμήρου ποιήσιν παρὰ τῶν ἀπογόνων Κρεωφύλου λαβὼν πρῶτος διεκόμισε εἰς Πελοπόννησον; and in Plutarch *Lycurg.* 4, who conceives Lycurgus as taking a copy from the heirs of Creophylus: ἐγράψατο προθύμως καὶ συνήγαγεν ὡς δεῦρο κομῶν. ἦν γὰρ τις ἦδη δόξα τῶν ἐπὶ αὐτῶν ἀμαυρὰ παρὰ τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, ἐκέκτηντο δὲ οὐ πολλοὶ μέρη τινα σποράδην τῆς ποιήσεως ὡς ἔτυχε διαφερομένης. Ephorus, on the other hand (*ap.* Strab. 482), reports the view that Lycurgus met Homer himself at Chios. The story can hardly have been absent in Timaeus (*fr.* 4) and Dieuchidas (*fr.* 5).

C. There is more abundant testimony to what Pisistratus is supposed to have done to the poems once in Attica. Cicero may take the lead (*de Or.* III. 137): *sed, ut ad Graecos referam orationem, septem fuisse dicuntur uno tempore qui sapientes et haberentur et uocarentur. hi omnes praeter Milesium Thalen civitatibus suis praeferunt. quis doctior iisdem illis temporibus, aut cuius eloquentia litteris instructior fuisse traditur quam Pisistrati? qui primus Homeri libros confusos antea sic disposuisse traditur ut nunc habemus. non fuit ille quidem civibus suis utilis, sed ita eloquentia floruit ut litteris doctrinaque praestaret.* Cicero's source is made out by Flach *l. c.* pp. 3 sqq. to have been Pergamene; the links were Athenodorus son of Sandon, Asclepiades of Myrlea (*p.* 11, n. 3), Crates. Without insistence on details<sup>1</sup> this result may be accepted. Cicero starts from the Pergamene conception of Pisistratus as one of the Seven Sages (on which see p. 50); in his further statements he is supported by Pausanias VII. 26. 13: *Αἰγείρας δὲ ἐν τῇ μεταξύ καὶ Πελλήνης πόλις ἡ Ἰσικωνίων Διονύσσης καλουμένη ἐγένετο μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν Σικωνίων ἀνάστατος, μνημονεύειν δὲ καὶ Ὀμηρον ἐν καταλόγῳ τῶν σὺν Ἀγαμέμνονι φασιν αὐτῆς ποιήσαντα ἔπος οὗτο· Ὑπερσίων τε καὶ αἰπεινὴν Δονόεσσαν.*

<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to dissociate Athenodorus Calvus (*ad Att.* XVI. 11. 4) from Ἀθηνόδωρος ἐκκλην Κερκυραῖος. Calvus seems only applicable as a nickname, and only a bald man would be noticeable for a κορβίλη or lump on the head.

Athenodorus would be charging Pisistratus with practices in which he himself indulged, if according to Isidore of Pergamus in *D. L.* VII. 34 he was detected in the expurgation of Zeno.







ἀναγινώσκουσιν, οὐκ ἔλαθε τοῦτο τοὺς κριτὰς, ἀλλὰ μὲν διὰ τὴν συνήθειαν καὶ πρόληψιν ἀφῆκαν αὐτοὺς κείσθαι. ὀβελίσκους δὲ ἐκάστω τῶν ἀδοκίμων καὶ ἀλλοτριῶν καὶ ἀναξίων τοῦ ποιητοῦ στίχων παρατιθέμενοι τοῦτο αὐτὸ ἐπεδείξαντο ὡς ἀνάξιοι εἶσι τοῦ Ὁμήρου. φέρεται καὶ ἐπίγραμμα εἰς τὸν Πεισίστρατον σπουδάζαντα συναγαγεῖν τὰ Ὁμήρου τοιοῦτον [ ].

The infantile legend of the LXXII. is evidently the same as that alluded to by Tzetzes [below]: the source is held to be Heliodorus, not the metrician, but a sixth century follower of Choeroboscus, to whom we owe a commentary on Dion. Thrax (Uhlig, *D. Thracis ars grammatica*; 1883, praef. XXXIV. sqq.). He is mentioned in the Latin version (Schol. Ar. ed. Dübner, XXII b 42): *Heliodorus multa alia nugatur quae longo conuicio Caecius reprehendit. nam ab LXXII doctis uiris a Pisistrato huic negotio praepositis dicit Homerum ita fuisse compositum, etc.*

The most explicit statement, however, is in the remarkable treatise by Tzetzes published by Cramer *An. Par.* I. 3 from the MS. *Paris grec* 2677 s. XVI. (= P) ff. 92 sqq. (repeated by Dübner, *Schol. Aristoph.* XVII. sqq., and Bergk *Aristophanes*, 1853, XXXV.), and by Studemund, *Philologus*, XLVI. 1 sqq. from five more MSS., *Paris* 2821, *Vat. graec.* 62 s. XVI., *Vat. graec.* 1385 s. XV. (= V), *Estensis* III. C. 14 (= M), *Paris supplém. grec* 655.

The important passage is p. 25 Cramer (XIX. 37 Dübner XXXVIII. 22 Bergk):

καίτοι τὰς Ὀμηρικὰς ἐξδομήκοντα δύο γραμματικοὶ ἐπὶ Πεισιστράτῳ τοῦ Ἀθηναίων τεράνουν διέθηκαν οὕτως ἐπορίδην οἷσας τὸ πρῖν. ἐπεκρίθησαν δὲ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκείνων τὸν καιρὸν ἔπ' Ἀριστάρχῳ καὶ Ζηνοδότῳ, ἄλλων οὐτῶν τούτων τῶν ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίῳ διορθῶ σάντων. οἱ δὲ τέσσαρσί τις τῶν ἐπὶ Πεισιστράτῳ διορθῶσιν ἀναφέρουσιν, Ὀρφεὶ Κροτωνιάτῃ, Ζωπύρῳ Ἡρακλεώτῃ, Ὀνομακρίτῳ Ἀθηναίῳ καὶ ἑπικοκύλῳ (so V and the Cambridge MS. *Bd.* 11. 70 s. XV.; καὶ ἐπὶ κογκύλῳ M; καὶ \*κατ' ἐπικοκύλῳ, marg.\* αθηνοδωρῷ ἐπικλῆν κορδυλίῳ P).

A Latin version of this article discovered by Ritschl (*Opusc.* I. 5) in a MS. of the Collegio Romano (4. C. 39. s. XV. now apparently lost, had the heading *ex caecio in commento comoediarum aristophanis in plato*, and preserves the same corruption *uidelicet concyli onomacriti*. Cf. also Dziatzko *Rh. Mus.* XLVI. 349. Giorgio Valla the Placentine in his book *Expetendorum et Fugientorum libri XXXVIII.* 1501, quoted by Studemund, gives the name as *epitencylo*.<sup>1</sup> It seems artificial not to see the source of this statement in Athenodorus head of the Pergamene library (D.L. VII. 1. 29, *Plut. Cat. min.* 6), or to deny that

<sup>1</sup> I have inspected *Par.* 2677 (which was collated by L. Cohn for Studemund). It is of the late sixteenth century. The word we print *κατ* ends in a letter which is not certainly γ, but more like γ than ν or τ. The scribe copied very accurately, as appears from a mark (~~~~) to indicate a gap inserted after *κογκύλῳ*. He apparently intended *αθηνοδωρῷ ἐπικλῆν κορδυλίῳ* as a correction of *κατ' ἐπὶ κογκύλῳ*, but it is inconceivable that it was his own conjecture, and the two phrases stand in no graphical relation to each other. He must have found the marginale in his original: the scribes of the other MSS.

omitted it. It is to be presumed the original ran *καὶ κατ' αθηνοδωρῷ ἐπικλῆν κορδυλίῳ ἐπικ, κ.τ.λ.*, and that when *ἀθ. ἐπικλ. κορ.* got into the margin (owing to the homoeoarchoon of *ἐπικλῆν* and *ἐπικογκύλῳ*) without its preposition it was assimilated to the case of the other proper names.—I owe the reading of the Cambridge MS. to Mr. Jenkinson. *Paris grec* 2821 and *suppl. grec* 655 want this part of the treatise, as do all the Bodleian Aristophanes MSS. (8), those in the British Museum (6), and the other Paris MSS. of the Plutus (about 21). *Par.* 2677 is therefore still unique.

the same was among Cicero's sources. Pergamos canonized Pisistratus among the Seven, and envisaged Homer as the work of his mystic commission.<sup>1</sup>

The three members whose names are clear, Orpheus,<sup>2</sup> Zopyrus, and Onomacritus, were three of the reputed authors of the Orphic corpus (Clemens Alex. *Strom.* I. 21),<sup>3</sup> to whom Epigenes ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῆς εἰς Ὀρφέα ποιήσεως ἀναφερομένης added Cecrops and Brontinus. We are therefore taken to Orphic-Pythagorean circles. Ritschl's conjecture Κέκρωψ is so far justified, but it lacks graphical probability. Among the Pythagoreans names in -υλος or -λος are frequent. I discover in Diels' *Vorsokratiker* Σύλλος, Ἐπίσυλος, Ἀγύλος, Ἀστύλος, Ὀκκελος, Ὀκκύλος, Βάθυλλος. Ἐπίσυλος is tempting, but leaves -κογκ- unaccounted for. May we fabricate a name Ἐπόκυλλος? Such a person may have played a part in the school of Pythagoras alongside of Brontinus and Brotinus, and so have attracted the notice of Athenodorus.<sup>4</sup> Valla's *epitencylus* is something like Ἐπιτύγχανος -ων, a late name.

D. Solon or Pisistratus is accused of having inserted several passages in the Homeric text.

(i.) B 558 of *Ajax*:

στήσῃ δ' ἄγων ἴν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσταντο φάλαγγες.

Strabo 394 καὶ νῦν μὲν ἔχουσιν Ἀθηναῖοι τὴν νῆσον, τὸ δὲ παλαιὸν πρὸς Μεγαρίας ὑπῆρχεν αὐτοῖς ἱερεῖς περὶ αὐτῆς· καὶ φασιν οἱ μὲν Πεισιστράτην οἱ δὲ Σόλωνα παρεγγράψαντας ἐν τῇ νῆῳ καταλόγῳ μετὰ τὸ ἔπος τοῦτο

ἔξῃς τοῦτο

Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δινοκαῖδεκα νῆας [557]

στήσῃ δ' ἄγων ἴν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσταντο φάλαγγες

μάρτυρι χρῆσθαι τῇ ποιητῇ τοῦ τὴν νῆσον ἐξ ἀρχῆς Ἀθηναίων ὑπάρχειν. οὐ παραδέχονται δὲ τοῦτ' οἱ κριτικοὶ διὰ τὸ πολλὰ τῶν ἐπῶν ἀντιμαρτυρεῖν αὐτοῖς. διὰ τί γὰρ ναυλοχῶν ἰσχυατος φαίνεται ὁ Αἴας, οὐ μετ' Ἀθηναίων ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῶν ὑπὸ Πρωτοσιλάῳ Θηταλῶν; [he then quotes N 681, Δ 327-330, Δ 273, Γ 230] οἱ μὲν δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι τοιαύτην τινα σκίψασθαι μαρτυρίαν παρ' Ὁμήρου δοκοῦσιν, οἱ δὲ Μεγαρεῖς ἀντιπαρρωδῆσαι οὕτως

Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν νῆας ἐκ τε Πολίχνης

ἐκ τ' Αἰγειροῦσσης Νισαῖης τε Τριπόδων τε,

ἃ ἔστι χωρία Μεγαρικά, ὧν οἱ Τρίποδες Τριποδίσκιον λέγεται, καθ' ὃ νῦν ἀγορὰ τῶν Μεγάρων κεῖται.

There is no good scholion on B 558, owing to the fact that the line is omitted in A, and the whole catalogue in T. Strabo's language (οἱ κριτικοί)

<sup>1</sup> The motive is obvious, and excuses their credulity, or the reckless use they made of Megarian allegation. They wished for an older rival to Ptolemy.

<sup>2</sup> Suidas: Ὀρφεύς· Κροτωνίδης, ἐποποιεῖς ἐν Πεισιστράτῳ συνῶναι τῷ τυράννῳ Ἀσκληπιάδῃ < FHG. III. 299 > φησὶν ἐν τῇ ἑκτῇ βιβλίῳ τῶν γραμματικῶν. As Asclepiades was Pergamene in school, this is considered another indication of the origin of this tradition. What kind of connection there was between the Megarean historians of the fourth century and the Perga-

mene librarians of the second does not appear.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the more confused list in Suidas, s.v. Ὀρφεύς (1).

<sup>4</sup> This source of emendation I see from Susemihl, *Alex. Litteraturgesch.* II. 246, had occurred in 1881 to Domenico Comparetti, in his treatise, *La commissione omerica di Pisistrato e il ciclo troico*, Torino, 1881, who read κατ' Ἀθ. τὸν Κορδυλιωνα ἐπικλῆν Ὀγκέλην. I make every *amendé* to my distinguished friend, who is equally at home in every period of ancient life.

and his  
Aristot  
on Γ 23

ὅτι  
συμφών  
[B 558]

cf. sch  
and th  
on B 5  
πρώτη  
actually  
cluding

Ari  
τούτων  
ἔσαν ἄλ  
Σαλαμῖ  
καὶ δρω  
δικαστά  
ἐμβολό

αὐτοὶ δ  
δικαστα  
κ.τ.λ.  
Atheni  
éditione  
I. 2. 4  
μετὰ τ

[τ

These  
follow

p. 34  
πρατο  
φησε  
εἶχον  
ἐνεποι

(  
his fri  
VII.

<sup>1</sup> Su  
extant  
426, 4  
used co  
barely  
608, 62

and his quotations show that he had access to the hypomnemata (Didymus, Aristonicus, and doubtless others) which are now represented by schol. A on  $\Gamma$  230:<sup>1</sup>

ὅτι πλησίον ὁ Ἰδομενεὺς Αἴαντος τοῦ Τελαμονίου ἐτάσσετο κατὰ τὴν ἐπιτάλῃσιν συμφώνως· παραιτήριον ἄρα ἐκείνου τὸν στίχον τὸν ἐν τῷ καταλόγῳ ὑπὸ τινων γραφόμενον [B 558]· οὐ γὰρ ἦσαν πλησίον Αἴαντος Ἀθηναῖοι.

cf. schol. A 365 and other exx. collected in the *Classical Review*, 1901, pp. 8, 9, and the *Odyssey*-scholia throughout. The MSS. BL have the following on B.557: γράφει δὲ καὶ τὸν Σόλωνος λόγον ὡς τινες παραλόγως. ἐν γὰρ τῇ πρώτῃ οὐκ εἶχε ποιήσει τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἡ ἀκολουθία οὕτως οὐδ' Ἀργος. The line is actually omitted by two papyri and about twenty-six mediaeval MSS., including Ven. A. The word παραιτεῖν is equivalent to ἀθετεῖν.

Aristotle *Rhet.* I. 15 μάρτυρες δὲ εἰσι διττοί, οἱ μὲν παλαιοὶ οἱ δὲ πρόσφατοι, καὶ τοῦτων οἱ μὲν μετέχοντες τοῦ κινδύνου οἱ δ' ἐκτός. λέγω δὲ παλαιούς μὲν τοὺς τε ποιητὰς καὶ ὄσων ἄλλων γνωρίμων εἰσι κρίσεις φανεραί, οἷον Ἀθηναῖοι Ὀμήρῳ μάρτυρι ἐχρήσαντο περὶ Σαλαμῖνος.<sup>2</sup> Plutarch *Solon* c. 10. οὐ μὴν ἄλλὰ τῶν Μεγαρέων ἱπμενόντων πολλὰ κακὰ καὶ δρῶντες ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ καὶ πάσχοντες ἐποίησαντο τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις διαλλακτὰς καὶ δικαστάς· οἱ μὲν οὖν πολλοὶ τῷ Σόλωνι συναγωνίσασθαι λέγουσι τὴν Ὀμήρου δόξαν· ἐμβαλόντα γὰρ αὐτὸν ἔπος εἰς νεῶν κατάλογον ἐπὶ τῆς δίκης ἀναγνώνας.

Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας,  
στήσῃ δ' ἄγων ἱν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσαντο φάλαγγες.

αὐτοὶ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι ταῦτα μὲν οἰοῦνται φληαρίαν εἶναι, τὸν δὲ Σόλωνά φασιν ἀποδείξαι τοῖς δικασταῖς ὅτι κ.τ.λ. . . . Ἡρίας δὲ ὁ Μεγαρεὺς [FHG. IV. 426, 7] ἐπιστάμενος λέγει κ.τ.λ. Quintilian V. 11. 40. *neque est ignobile exemplum [auctoritatis] Megariorum ab Atheniensibus cum de Salamine contenderent victos Homerum uersu qui tamen ipse non in omni editione reperitur significans Aiacem naues suas Atheniensibus inuxisse.* Diog. Laert. I. 2. 48 ἐνιοὶ δὲ φασὶ καὶ ἐγγράφαι αὐτὸν [τὸν Σόλωνα] εἰς τὸν κατάλογον τοῦ Ὀμήρου μετὰ τὸν

Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας

[τὸν]

στήσῃ δ' ἄγων ἱν' Ἀθηναίων ἴσαντο φάλαγγες.

These mentions of Megara and Megarean authorities (and those which follow) make Ritschl's supplement in the passage Diog. Laert. I. 2. 5 quoted p. 34 practically certain: viz. μάλλον οὖν Σόλων Ὀμηρον ἐφώτισεν ἢ Πεισίστρατος [ὅσπερ συλλέξας τὰ Ὀμήρου ἐνεποίησέ τινα εἰς τὴν Ἀθηναίων χάριν] ὡς φησὶ Διευχίδας ἐν ἐ' Μεγαρικῶν. ἦν δὲ μάλιστα τὰ ἐπη ταῦτα· οἱ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς. Here συλλέξας is not absolutely required by ἐφώτισε, ἐνεποίησε is required.

(ii.) B 573 οἱ θ' Ὀτρυνήσιν τε καὶ αἰπεινὴν Γονέεσσαν. Pisistratus or one of his friends unwittingly wrote Γονέεσσαν for Δονέεσσαν, according to Pausanias VII. 26. 13 quoted p. 36.

<sup>1</sup> Strabo has many coincidences with our extant scholia: e.g. 3, 328, 348, 367, 413, 424, 426, 439, 454, 543, 601, 616. Places where he used commentaries which are unrepresented, or barely represented, in our scholia are 550, 605, 608, 626.

<sup>2</sup> That the Athenians did actually rely upon this verse is quite probable. That it gave them no real title, and was merely an indication of the moorings of Ajax' ships at Aulis, like 526 of the Phocians, I have said elsewhere.

## (iii.) λ 631 :

Plut. *Thes.* XX. πολλοὶ δὲ λόγοι καὶ περὶ τοιούτων ἐτι λέγονται καὶ περὶ τῆς Ἀριάδνης οὐδὲν ὁμολογοῦμενον ἔχοντες. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀπάγξασθαι φασιν αὐτὴν ἀπολειφθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Θησεύς, οἱ δ' εἰς Νάξον ὑπὸ ναυτῶν κομισθεῖσαν Οἰνάρῳ τῷ ἱερεὶ τοῦ Διονύσου συνοικεῖν, ἀπολειφθῆναι δὲ τοῦ Θησεύς ἐρώντος ἑτέρας.

δεινὸς γὰρ μιν ἔπειρεν ἔρως Πανοπιδὸς Αἰγλῆς. (*fr.* 105)

τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ἔπος ἐκ τῶν Ἡσιόδου Πεισίστρατον ἐξελεῖν φησιν Ἡρέας ὁ Μεγαρεὺς, ὥσπερ αὐτὸν πάλιν ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου νεκυῖαν τὸ

Θησεία Πειρίθοόν τε θεῶν ἀριδείκετα τέκνα (λ 631)

χαριζόμενον Ἀθηναίοις.

Hereas deals with Theseus again *ib.* XXXII.

(iv.) K of the *Iliad*. schol. T ad init. φασὶ τὴν ῥαψοδίαν ἴφ' Ὀμήρου ἰδίᾳ τετάχθαι καὶ μὴ εἶναι μέρος τῆς Ἰλιάδος, ὑπὸ δὲ Πεισιστράτου τετάχθαι εἰς τὴν ποιήσιν.

(v.) λ 602-4.

εἶδωλον, αὐτὸς δὲ μετ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι  
τέρπεται ἐν θαλίῃς καὶ ἔχει καλλίσφυρον Ἥβην  
παῖδα Διὸς μεγάλου καὶ Ἥρης χρυσοπεδύλου

were added by Onomacritus, an ἐταῖρος of Pisistratus : ἀθετοῦνται καὶ λέγονται Ὀνομακρίτου εἶναι, schol. ad loc. (cf. Hes. *Theog.* 950 sqq.).

(vi.) Ox. Pap. 412. Julius Africanus, after quoting seven lines as Homeric which end with λ 51, says : εἴτ' οὖν οὕτως ἔχον αὐτὸς ὁ ποιητὴς τὸ περιέργον τῆς ἐπιρρησεως τὰ ἄλλα διὰ τὸ τῆς ὑποθέσεως ἀξίωμα σεσιώπηκεν, εἰθ' οἱ Πεισιστράτιδαι τὰ ἄλλα συνγράφοντες ἔπη ταῦτα ἀπέσχισαν, ἀλλότρια τοῦ στοίχου τῆς ποιήσεως ἐκεῖνα ἐπικρίναντες, ἐπὶ πολλοῖς ἐγνώκατε κῆμα πολυτελέστερον. Here the commission has advanced to the position of the Alexandrines and extirpates verses on their merits. So Tzetzes, quoted p. 37, invented a Pisistratean Aristarchus and Zenodotus.

## II.

This is the evidence upon which Pisistratus is believed nowadays to have constructed the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* out of lays or earlier poetical material ; to have separated these poems from the mass of heroic verse ; to have given them an Athenian colour by the operations of excision, interpolation and the like. I submit in this paper that this belief, ancient and modern, whatever expression it takes, is false, and that Solon, Pisistratus and Hipparchus had no dealings with the Homeric text and could have had none.

## A.

The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as we have them stand in an obvious relation to the poems of the Trojan cycle as they existed during the literary period of antiquity. The latter appear to presuppose the former. The immense discrepancy in size, and consequently in treatment, between the *Iliad* and

*Odyssey* ascribing the pres fill up the *Iliad* and the *Aet* poems their almost really i and He with th these e an intr Nostos for ins Agame clearly of the certain *Iliad*, v three c and Ac means been p reason fession At all The R Agias Ulysse it? T is, an omitt proph books, time c and th T relatio Schoo satisfi

And the The

*Odyssey* on the one hand, and the *Cypria* etc. on the other, prevent us from ascribing the same or similar origins in place or time to all the poems; and the presumption is that the shorter poems follow in time the two longer, and fill up the intervals in the story which they left. The converse, viz. that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were originally short poems, of the compass of the *Cypria* or the *Aethiopis* and coeval with them, can hardly be the case, since the cyclic poems are plainly annalistic, and depend for their value, as Proclus said, on their ἀκολουθία τῶν πραγμάτων. The subject of the *Iliad* is unimportant and almost momentary. From an annalistic standpoint the deaths of Rhesus (a really important episode, which Homer treats lightly), Sarpedon, Patroclus and Hector are all that there is to mention. No poet writing on the scale or with the ideas of Stasinus or Arctinus would have devoted a separate poem to these events. They would have either been included in the *Cypria* or formed an introduction to the *Aethiopis*. The subject of the *Odyssey* again is one *Nostos*. This of course would have fallen with the other *Nόστοι*; it was for instance far less historically and dramatically important than that of Agamemnon. The relation between the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and the Cycle is clearly, as Greek tradition had it, that the latter is conditioned by the existence of the former. The *Cypria* has an indeterminate subject, with a beginning certainly, but with no end. Its end was made for it by the beginning of the *Iliad*, which it all but overlaps. The *Aethiopis* is even worse off: it contains three episodes, which we may represent by Penthesilea, Aethiopis proper, and Achilles' death. That is to say, it began where the *Iliad* left off (and the means by which it was attached thereto, viz. the modification of Ω 804, has been preserved<sup>1</sup>), and ended where it does we do not know why: there is no reason why it should ever have ended. I have suggested<sup>2</sup> that some professional covenant determined where Arctinus should end and Lesches begin. At all events we find the rest of the *Siege* divided between these two artists. The *Returns* then follows, and this (a natural enough theme) was treated by Agias with one remarkable exception, as I have observed above, the return of Ulysses. But that it had been treated already why should Agias have omitted it? Treated annalistically, as Eumelus e.g. would have done, 500 lines (that is, an average book) would have conducted Ulysses home. However Agias omitted this topic, and even more singularly we find the heroes' last days, prophesied but not related by Homer, detailed in a curious little poem of two books, the *Telegonia*. It is then plain that the Cycle, as it existed down to the time of Proclus, implies the pre-existence of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of the theme and the compass which belong to them now.

This also was the universal ancient tradition, which represented the relation of Homer to the cyclic and hymnal poets as that of a master to his School. It is only a constitutional aversion to tradition that can fail to be satisfied with this natural and organic relation. The School meets us in

<sup>1</sup> And resemble the lines (1021, 2) by which the *Theogony* was connected with the *Hoia*.

<sup>2</sup> C.Q. 1908, p. 85.

antiquity in the *corpora* of Hippocrates, Plato and Aristotle which survive: in the Hesiodic poems, which partly survive, and the Orphic writings, which do not survive. I need not do more than mention the mediaeval Italian painters and sculptors. The characteristics of the School are two: first, the division of labour between the Master and the Disciple. In the *atelier* the Master gives out the theme and corrects the pupil's work. In literature the Master starts the subject, the pupils, either contemporary, as in the Peripatetic case, or later, as in the Hesiodic, continue it and cover the parts of the field the Master leaves. The second characteristic is the anonymity of the product. The pupil does not exist. The Master is all in all. In the cases before us this secret has been preserved in the cases of Hesiod, Plato, Hippocrates and Aristotle. Tradition in the case of Hesiod,<sup>1</sup> later study in the other three instances, informed the ancient world of the heterogeneity of these *corpora*; but the self-denial of the pupils had been complete. Their names were lost. It was different with the *Orphica*: Clement of Alexandria has given us the key to this School (*Strom.* I. 21.=131): on the authority of Epigenes who had investigated the subject (*ἐν τοῖς περὶ τῆς εἰς Ὀρφέα ἀναφερομένης ποιήσεως*) the authors were Onomacritus, Zopyrus, Prodicus, Cecrops and Brontinus: one poem, the *ἐλς ἄδων κατάβασις*, was variously given to Cecrops and to Prodicus. It was different also with the Cycle. Candidates for all the poems are extant, and about the *Cypria* and the *Μικρὰ Ἰλιάς* there were differences of opinion. How this *secret de polichinelle* was worked we do not know: the poems clearly were anonymous: even when the *Theogony* speaks of Hesiodos the writer suppresses himself. Cynaethus, the reputed author of the hymn to Apollo, makes desperate efforts to distinguish himself by all the identification possible short of his name (*H. Apoll.* 172 sqq.): country, physical peculiarity, talents. Yet he had no success: the hymn was used as Homeric by Thucydides, and all the rhapsode achieved was to fasten his own blindness on his master. Hippostratus the Sicilian horographer gives us the clue: and the answer to my question is perhaps this. The poems themselves were anonymous, and the reader took them for the work of the master.<sup>2</sup> The local *ὠρογράφος*, Artemon or Hippostratus or the source of schol. *Ar. Pax* 1270, recorded the claims of his fellow-countryman to distinction. *Campanilismo* knows no modesty. The pupil effaced himself, and the Master took the credit with the general public, the reader and the collector. The local historian, or the *mémoriste*, the Vasari, kept the truth in many cases, but he was not heard by the public, even by Aristotle. At last came the critic; but he was often too late to produce more than an *amico di Sandro* or an *Ὀμηριδῶν τις*.<sup>3</sup>

If the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are presupposed by the Cycle, if we can find the date of the Cycle we have found the period which is the last at which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* can have been put together or materially modified. After the

<sup>1</sup> *Apud* Paus. IX. 31. 4.

<sup>2</sup> When Herodotus doubts the ascription of the *Cypria* to Homer he does so on critical grounds, not in obedience to authority.

<sup>3</sup> This is in substance the older view. Most recent criticism (e.g., Hiller, *Homer als Collectionnaire*, *Rh. Mus.*, 1887, p. 321) seems to me artificial and contrary to nature.

Cycle I  
or his  
750-600  
Hom.  
Wilam  
not sta  
record

TH  
followi  
ἀπογόν  
'Αρτέμ  
ἐτη τῶ  
and w  
and the  
who a  
beat hi  
The T  
had, o  
centur  
dates  
geneal  
*Strom.*  
on the  
Syracu  
Hippo  
Syracu  
wrong  
end of  
betwe  
These

O  
compi  
not c  
eviden  
inciden  
import  
been o  
belong  
Still h  
his fe  
logica  
author  
he doe  
ways;

Cycle has come into existence none of the feats ascribed to Solon, Pisistratus or his commission are possible. The traditional date for the Cycle is from 750-600 in round figures. This has been denied by Wilamowitz-Möllendorf, *Hom. Unt.* 348 sqq., and is often disbelieved. I cannot however regard Wilamowitz's statement as more than rhetoric, and possibly its author does not stand by it now. It is based on nothing more than a prejudice against recorded statements.

The passages bearing on the dates of the poems of the Cycle are the following. *Aethiopia*: an article in Suidas; 'Ἀρκτίνος Τήλεω τοῦ Ναύτεω ἀπογόνου, Μιλήσιος, ἐποποιός, μαθητὴς Ὀμήρου, ὡς λέγει ὁ Κλαζομένιος Ἀρτέμων ἐν τῷ περὶ Ὀμήρου, γεγονώς κατὰ τὴν θ' Ὀλυμπιάδα μετὰ τετρακόσια ἔτη τῶν Τρωϊκῶν. Artemo (*FHG.* IV. 341) was a Clazomenian horographer, and with professional accuracy guarantees his date by two eras, the Trojan and the Olympiad. Lesches rests on Phantias the Peripatetic (*FHG.* II. 299), who arrives at his epoch by a description, 'he contended with Arctinus and beat him,' i.e. he stood to Arctinus in the relation of Sophocles to Aeschylus. The *Thebais* is older than Callinus (*fr.* 6); for Callinus we have, as the ancients had, only an inferential date, but he cannot be later than the early seventh century. Nothing has survived upon Agias and the rest, but similar descriptive dates exist for two other poets of this period. Eumelus the Corinthian genealogist 'fell in the time of Archias founder of Syracuse,' Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. 21, and Cynaethus, reputed author of the *Hymn to Apollo*, is dated on the same method ('he was the first to recite the Homeric poems in Syracuse, *Ol.* 69') by the local Sicilian historian Hippostratus (*FHG.* IV. 432). Hippostratus by his Olympiad contradicts his statement, for we cannot suppose Syracuse did not hear Homer till Pindar's time. His figures therefore are wrong (for the contents of the *Hymn* also show it was much earlier than the end of the sixth century), as in his date for Abaris (*fr.* 3) his MSS. vary between γ' and νγ'. The same has happened in many of Eusebius' entries. These graphical variants do not invalidate the sources.

Of these authors Artemon and Hippostratus are annalists. Artemon compiled *ἔφοι*, Hippostratus dealt in *γενεαλογίαι*. Their dates therefore are not critical, matters of inference, but traditional. They constitute better evidence than constructed dates. Cynaethus and his visit were only an incident in the history of Syracuse, Arctinus was only an incident, if a more important and lasting one, in the almanac of Miletus. Eumelus must have been connected with Archias by some entry in a calendar. Phantias it is true belongs to the class of learned historians; he arranges writers in a sequence. Still he was a compatriot of Lesches, and though he did the best he could for his fellow-countryman, he must as a Lesbian have had access to local chronological sources. He is not bound to have exaggerated and invented. The author of the Parian chronicle is indifferent to Paros (Jacoby, *Rh. Mus.* 59. 78); he does not exalt Archilochus. And generally speaking local rivalry cuts two ways; it tends to invention and to exaggeration, but *pari passu* exercises a



check upon these tendencies in others. Spello and Assisi still contend for Propertius; whichever is right it is ascertained that Propertius was born in sight of Monte Subasio; Foligno or Spoleto have no chance. It is probable that the truth of Homer's career was fairly correctly thrashed out between Cyme, Smyrna, Chios and Ios. The sources of the dates of the Cycle therefore go back to documentary non-inferential sources. They are not due to reasoning upon statements made in the poems—in the way that Theopompus brought Homer down to the seventh century, misled evidently by an allusion in some hymn or cyclic epos, and Plutarch argues to the date of Antimachus of Teos from a reference to an eclipse in the *Epigoni* (uit. Romul. 12)—but to local records.

Next the period to which the older part of the Cycle (viz. Arctinus' two poems, Lesches' Ἰλιάς μικρά, presumably the *Cypria*, besides the *Thebais* and the *Epigoni*) belongs, viz. 730-680 or thereabouts, is supported by the scanty information we have about other epic work.

Archilochus lived *Ol.* 20, Callinus was older than he, οὐ μικρόν; Callinus mentioned the *Thebais* as Homeric (fr. 6). The *Thebais* clearly goes into the eighth century (see Strabo 647, Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I. 131). Magnes' Lydian epos was written at the court of Gyges, when the Greek coast towns were free (Nicolaus Damasc. *FHG.* III. 395, 6). Gyges reigned 'about 660 B.C.' I read in Lehmann-Haupt's *Solon of Athens*, p. 23.<sup>1</sup> Aristeas, the mage-poet of Proconnesus, is located by Herodotus IV. 15 after calculation at about 670 B.C. Another calculation in Plutarch, as we have seen, made Antimachus of Teos (perhaps author of the *Epigoni*) live in *Ol.* 6. 3. These statements, tradition or calculation, are in harmony with the annalistic tradition which puts the oldest Cyclics into the eighth century, and in so far support it. And when we find that the latest cyclic poem in order of subject, the *Telegonia*, was written by a native of Cyrene (colonized B.C. 640-631), it appears reasonable to assign the period of the production of the Cycle to 750-600 in round figures.

Another consideration supports this date. It appears to agree with the general development of Greek literature. We cannot theorize as to when the Cycle must or should have begun, seeing that it is itself the first documentary fact in Greek literature: the Herodotean or Parian date for Homer would suit the period 750-600 for its development, but the anterior limit had better be left alone. It is unlikely however that an important movement such as the Cycle and other late epic work (the Corinthian school, the *Hymns*, etc.) were, should have found its inception later than 700 B.C. There is so to speak no room in the seventh, even less in the sixth century for such a birth. It is likely enough that post-Homeric epos, once started, dragged its length through these two centuries to end in heraldic and genealogical poems only distinguishable by metre from the first prose logographoi, into which they passed by a silent process; but to start the movement, let us say at 650, seems out of keeping

<sup>1</sup> Magnes' poem is perhaps the Ἀμυσῖννα, A Smyrnaean at this time promulgated an heroic catalogued among the Homeric works by Suidas. poem as Homeric.



with what we know of the birth and rate of progression of literary genera. The forms of art which came to the birth in the seventh century were elegy and iambic satire, the music of the Terpandrian lyre, the Corinthian dithyramb, and the refreshed melic epos of Stesichorus. These novelties were to push the rhapsode and his epos eventually off the field;<sup>1</sup> it is not at this moment that we must place the post-Homeric revival, the substantial and genuine work of Cynaethus, Eumelus, Arctinus and Stasinus. Still less is the sixth century suitable. Lesbian lyrics open it, and a new visible art begins in its middle, the actor and his boards. These centuries are suitable for the continuance and decay of the Homeric. We may easily assign the *Hymn to Hermes*<sup>2</sup> and the *Telegonia* to the end of the seventh century, but the beginnings of the art of which these were the last specimens must be far earlier; and that they were earlier is confirmed as well by the analysis of the literature which exists—the larger Homeric *Hymns* and Hesiod—as by the tradition which we have noticed. The traditional date therefore for the Epic Revival, the years following *Ol.* 11, appears to correspond to the necessities of the case. The comparatively clear field of the eighth century is required to account for the confidence of poets, who depended on public taste and the vogue of the heroic past, in undertaking works which gave them, as in the case of Cynaethus, an international position.

Now, if the received date for the Cycle holds, and the cyclic poems presuppose, as we have seen, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in their actual compass, it is evident that none of the operations upon Homer ascribed to Solon, Pisistratus, or Hipparchus, can have taken place. If about *Ol.* 10, or 750 B.C., the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* existed and had monopolized certain episodes in the Tale of Troy, so that the epigoni, like Arctinus and Stasinus, had the choice between events anterior to the *Iliad* and subsequent to the *Iliad*, then the idea that Homer was brought to Greece in the sixth century, or constructed out of lays into poems in the sixth century, or written down in the sixth century, vanishes. We have still to ask how the legend arose; but the legend itself, unless the Cycle can be successfully post-dated, is dead.

## B.

This argument appears to me convincing, and for eristic purposes nothing need be added. Still, there is another order of considerations which bears on the question, and should be stated. The poems, and especially the *Catalogue*, are said to have been made use of on several occasions as historical evidence.

<sup>1</sup> This is not mere surmise; the *Hymn to Hermes*, though the story is frequent in later literature, is all but never mentioned. Alcaeus killed it. The *Iliu persis* of Arctinus is superseded in the *Tabula Iliaca* by that of Stesichorus.

<sup>2</sup> Pylos in the *Hymn to Hermes* is Alphean or Triphylian. The Triphylian Pylos seems to have perished from the Greek world in the events which are recorded Herod. IV. 145 sqq.

The Minyae expelled the Paroreatae and Caucones and founded six new *communes* in their country. This was before the colonization of Cyrene. The *Hymn* must either have been made before Pylos was destroyed or not long after, considering the rapidity with which it was forgotten. The neighbouring Samos is alive in Stesichorus *fr.* 44.

Herodotus informs us, V. 94, that in the dispute between Athens and Mitylene for the possession of Sigeion, the Athenians relied for a title upon their participation in the Trojan War: ἀποδεικνύντες λόγῳ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον Αἰολεῦσι μετέδῃ τῆς Ἰλιάδος χώρης ἣ οὐ καὶ σφίσι καὶ τοῖσι ἄλλοισι ὅσοι Ἑλλήνων συνεπρήξαντο Μενέλεω τὰς Ἑλένης ἀρπαγὰς. Herodotus represents these events as taking place in the reign of Pisistratus. If this were the case, the Athenians put forward the passages in the *Iliad* which, according to modern criticism, had been inserted by their sovereign, and more than that, appealed to a document compiled at Athens out of loose lays, and even written down there for the first time. This would be a very curious title to rely upon in any period of International Law, and the Lesbians would have had a plain answer to give. If, on the other hand, we believe with modern historians (e.g., Lehmann-Haupt, *Solon*, p. 50 n. 13) that the events in question took place a generation earlier, i.e. about 600 B.C., then the Athenian entry in the *Catalogue* is seen to have been appealed to about the time that Pisistratus was getting born. It was not fabricated by him at least.

If it were advanced that, notwithstanding other difficulties, people in the sixth century were simple and unacquainted with fraud—a supposition quite gratuitous in itself—we have the curious instance of Onomacritus to the contrary. Onomacritus, entrusted with the custody of the Pisistratean *corpus* of oracles (Herod. VII. 6), added one thereto upon the disappearance of Lemnos. Tradition does not give the intention of the forgery (v. Macan, *ad loc.*), but it can hardly have been other than political, and connected with Athenian designs upon the Hellespont. He was detected in this fraud by Lasos, a professional brother, and banished. If such a comparatively venial crime was both detected and punished, how could Pisistratus' supposed operations on the Homeric text (which must have been carried out through this expert and his colleagues<sup>1</sup>) have escaped notice, and how could such a falsified witness have been produced in international matters?

For it was again appealed to in the generation after Hipparchus, when before Gelo (Herod. VII. 161) the Athenians claimed naval precedence on the ground that their leader at Troy was distinguished for his skill at moving bodies of men. This, of course, is a direct allusion to the most patent of Athenian interpolations, B 552-5, athetized (though not on this ground) by Zenodotus. The Syracusans, who had known the Ionic poet for two hundred years since Cynaethus imported him, must have smiled at the Athenian version of the *libro d'oro*, and at their shamelessness in quoting it. And even when the unhappy Phocians in the fourth century based their claim to Apollo's treasury on another entry in the *Catalogue*, though their impiety was abominated, their document was not attacked. Yet the fourth century is the century of Dieuchidas, and perhaps of Hereas also, who charged Pisistratus with adapting the *Catalogue* to his country's interest. A document appealed to in inter-State matters from the seventh to the fourth century must have been safe from

<sup>1</sup> As is stated of λ 602-4; cf. p. 40.

alteration by interested parties. It must have been what we call canonical. This is a long way from interpolating, compiling, and writing down the *Iliad* in Pisistratus' chanceries.

## C.

Pisistratus having composed, edited, and interpolated Homer, it follows that the actual poems contain his interpolations. The ancients detected K, B 558 and a few more lines (see p. 40); the moderns, with perfect consistency and larger views, have seen further, and the present state of opinion is practically that all mentions of Athens, Athena, Attica, and Athenians are interpolated. I refer for details to Dr. Leaf, who has made himself the receptacle of this as of most other current views.

It is difficult to understand the mental attitude of German critics and their English followers. Do they understand what interpolation means? Interpolation of a document, alteration of a legend, like all conscious human action, is dictated by motive—by the motive of your own honour, glory, or profit. You do not finger documents and colour legends for the fun of the thing. Let us take an example or two. The oldest version of Apollo's invasion of Greece made him alight on land opposite to Chalcis and proceed along the later 'pilgrims' way' to Delphi. The Theban Pindar set him down at Tanagra, the Athenian Aeschylus landed him direct at Piraeus. In the pro-Athenian Dares of Phrygia Agamemnon collects his fleet not in Boeotian Aulis, but at the port of Athens; Menestheus is allowed to wound Hector. There are signs that the Athenians were discontented with Homer as he stands; the absence of the children of Theseus at Troy stuck in their throats. The Athenian family Acamantidae asserted that Homer said Acamas was really at Troy (Demosth. *Epitaph.* 29); we do not know if they aspired to alter the *Iliad*, or were content with a place in the *Cypria*. Euripides (*Iph. Aul.* 248), with some tact, disguised the Athenian leader as *ὁ Θεσέως παῖς*, but ejected Menestheus whom the envoys vaunted to Gelo, and increased the Athenian contingent by ten at the expense of Argos. The awkward Menestheus was got rid of, we do not know by whom (Eusebius, *Canon.* p. 128 Scal.), by being made to die at Melos on his nostos. The Cycle had already allowed Demophon and Acamas to be present at Troy, probably as private combatants. These are cases of proved interference with history, for intelligible reasons, if without success so far as the Homeric text is concerned.<sup>1</sup>

If we now look at the Pisistratean Homer—that is to say, the text which we possess—compiled, copied, edited, and interpolated by Pisistratus and his board of experts, where are the signs of the Athenian interests served by all this apparatus? I can be shorter here because the subject is receiving the attention of Professor John A. Scott ('Athenian Interpolations in Homer' part I, *Classical Philology*, 1911, pp. 419 sqq.). I will first ask what we should expect to find in the Attic Homer, next what we do find. In an ancient

<sup>1</sup> Yet one of Euripides' new numbers—the papyrus (see on B 748). contingent from Dodona—did get into one.

historical document edited in the interest of a given community we expect to find (a) the community in a front position at the supposed time of the action in question; (b) forecasts, prophecies, visions, oracles, and other anachronistic allusions to the actual position of the community. Athenian tragedy is shameless in these respects (like Shakespeare). Hesiod and the Cycle yielded to the pressure of their times.<sup>1</sup> Now under the first head it is plain that the position of Athens is not at all prominent or important in the heroic age as described by Homer. The armament starts from Aulis, not from Piraeus or Phalerum. Menestheus, the leader of the contingent, is not a first-class hero, and practically gets no mention. The size of the contingent (50) is half-way between Agamemnon (100) and Nireus (3). Attica occupies a position slightly better than that of the Locrians or the Eleans; it is behind Arcadia, and on a level with Thebes. In book N it is one among several weak contingents; inferentially it bore the Ionian name, but the word slips in without emphasis and clearly without glory. This is not the result of political tampering with a document. It is not a heraldic past.<sup>2</sup>

If we ask what the Athenians would have done to Homer had they edited him, the most obvious prophecy which we should have expected to find is that of the colonization of Asia in any of its aspects (founders, struggles with natives, etc.), and especially as having proceeded from Athens. The Ionians in whose hands Homer was at his beginning and for several centuries considered Athens their mother. Solon calls Athens the oldest land of *Ἰαῶνία*; in his day this relation to Ionia was Athens' whole political past, all she could point to besides Menestheus. If she thought this entry in the *Catalogue* enough to justify her claim to Sigeion, what would she not have inferred from a forecast of the hearth from which the Ionian settlers started? And if she could interpolate Homer, so as to insert Menestheus and Erechtheus, why did she not insert this essential title? Some reference to Aegina also might have been expected. Other allusions we should have found are detailed by Mr. Scott, a portion of whose list I venture to reproduce.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Hesiod let in Megara, *fr.* 96, 8; the *Návra* admitted Colophon. The Tauri appear in the *Cypria*, the island Leuce appears in the *Arktiois*.

<sup>2</sup> Yet *N* is considered a self-evident Athenian interpolation. I venture to repeat my remarks of 1906 (*Classical Review*, XX, p. 194): 'the intangibility of the *Catalogue* is most strikingly shown by the insignificant position of Athens. Modern opinion has allowed itself to be dominated by the idle legends of lines added here and there by Pisistratus and others; even these legends betray the all but total absence of such attempts, and their ill-success. The Athenians in Homer appear as the unimportant tribe they were: a remnant perhaps of the *prae-Pelopid* inhabitants, at all events brigaded with leavings and effeminate peoples, Locrians, Epeans—bowmen who did not wear armour, and whose position was defined as 'opposite Euboea.' If the *Ἰδαιονες* is a conglomerate, why did not the

Athenians, in whose hands the text is supposed to have lain, and may have lain, give themselves a better place?'

<sup>3</sup> *i.e.* p. 427. <sup>1</sup> Oedipus died at Thebes, *ψ* 679, quite contrary to Attic tradition; Tydeus was buried at Thebes, *ε* 114, while the Athenians prided themselves on his burial at Eleusis; Philomela is the daughter of Pandareus, *τ* 518, not of the Athenian Pandion; B 107 shows no traces of the strife between Atreus and Thyestes; II 718, Hecuba is daughter of Dymas, in Attic tradition of Cisseus; H 392 and N 626 seem to show that Homer knew nothing of the relations existing between Theseus and Helen before her marriage with Menelaus; *γ* 307, Orestes returns to his home from Athens, not from Phocis; I 145 gives names for the daughters of Agamemnon different from the names given by the Athenians. . . . Bellerophon has no help from Pegasus, and Cassandra is no prophetess. . . .

The position of Athens in the poems appears to correspond to her actual position in the heroic age. Attica we know was inhabited in the Mycenaean period, not only the hill of Athens but the country districts. Its oil, coastline, and perhaps mines must have given it a substantial if undistinguished position in the Mycenaean world. No reason can be given why Athena should not have been worshipped in her name-town (among other places): Erectheus is a pre-Olympian, one of the early daimones in favour at present with historians of religion. He is therefore a valuable survival, not an addition.

No more chicken-hearted scheme of aggrandisement was ever carried out by a monarch and his advisers. If the legend was due, as we shall see, to the malevolence of the ancients, it owes its continuance to the thoughtlessness of the modern historian.<sup>1</sup>

### III.

We have now seen that the manufacture or compilation of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* by Pisistratus or anyone else of his period is inconsistent with the date of the Epic Cycle; that the editing or interpolation of the poems by him is inconceivable in view of the use made of them in international law; and that the position given to Athens in Homer is correct and historical, whereas interpolation in the national interest must have made that position quite different; and finally that the ascertainable efforts at interpolation were few and unsuccessful. We therefore conclude that Homer was canonical and intangible before the sixth century.

We have next to explain how the Pisistratus legend arose. If it is so evidently at issue with the truth, how do we account for its existence?

This question may be answered at once and without mystery. The whole legend, saving the statements about the recitation at the Panathenaea, was fabricated by Megarian antiquaries. This was seen by Flach, *l.c.* pp. 27 sqq., and I put it as clearly as I could in the *Classical Review*, 1907, p. 18.

Megara, as we all know, lost Salamis to Athens in the time of Pisistratus; she was despised and oppressed by Athens throughout the next century. No material revenge was possible to her. She did what she could by slander and misrepresentation. Thus, as Aristotle tells us, she claimed to be the mother of the comedy which had said such hard things about her. She wished, like many other states, to get herself a position in the heroic age. The 'Megarians,'

Is it reasonable to suppose that the Athenians had such control of these poems as to insert Pisistratus and to glorify Athena, yet never took the pains to reshape these traditions, so easily changed?

<sup>1</sup> The particular passages which have been detected as Athenian interpolations are discussed by Professor Scott and Mr. Lang. I will only add that if Pisistratus proved his descent from

Nestor by the somewhat obscure expedient of inserting the journey of Telemachus (and Pisistratus) to Sparta, then the entry about the Lapiths in the *Catalogue*, and doubtless the mention of the whole barony is the work of Periander. But the Neleidae of the colonization may be relied upon to have seen to the preservation of their pedigree centuries before Pisistratus appeared upon the scene.

says Strabo 394, offered as the original version of the list of Ajax' forces the lines:

ἐκ τε Πολίχνης  
ἐκ τ' Αἰγυριούσσης Νισαίης τε Τριπόδων τε

ἃ ἔστι χωρία Μεγαρικά.

They accused Pisistratus of expelling these lines. A more definite source, Hereas of Megara (*FHG.* IV. 426, 7), appears in Plutarch, *Theseus* 20, for Pisistratus' removal of *fr.* 105 from Hesiod, and his insertion of λ 631 into the *Odyssey* (χαρίζομενον Ἀθηναίους). Dieuchidas (*FHG.* IV. 388) is agreed to be another authority for the legend of the insertion of B 568 (see pp. 34, 36). A thorough-going Dorian, he also claimed ἀργεῖς and the bones of Adrastus *fr.* 2 and 3). Megarian writers' ((Μεγαρόθεν συγγραφείς) took away the credit of Theseus' feat in killing Sciron. Sciron, who was of course a Megarian, was no brigand, but an honest man. Theseus' deed was mere murder, not a public service (Plut. *Thes.* 10). Philochorus, *fr.* 42, had explained Athena's title of Σκίρας as from one Scirus of Eleusis; Praxion ἐν β' Μεγαρικῶν (*FGH.* IV. 483) referred it to the Megarian Sciron. Natural jealousy and hereditary dislike account for these accusations and polemics, and dislike of Athens was not limited to Megara. Daphidas of Telmisa, a grammarian of the time of Attalus, charged Homer himself with falsehood: Ἀθηναῖοι γὰρ οὐκ ἐστράτευσαν ἐπὶ Ἴλιον. (Suidas s.v. Δαφίδας.) Her enemies would not allow her even a contingent. Daphidas may have had relations with the anti-Athenian Pergamenes.

The Megarians, then, full of prejudices and determined to make their way into the heroic age, declared statements in Homer which hindered their claim and exalted their neighbours to be false. They did not succeed in their claim, but by one means or another they did dislodge the offending line B 558 from many MSS, at least by Quintilian's time; and we find them seated within the less canonical Hesiod (*fr.* 96, 8). They took as a scapegoat Pisistratus. 'Pisistratus undertook the character of forger, an embodied τῆς.' That he did so is plain, but the reason the Megarians had for pitching on him more than another had not been clear. This I think I now see.

Pisistratus, who to us and in ordinary Athenian literature is a statesman and despot, at best a patron—another Polycrates or Gelo—bore another character in some ancient paths of opinion. He was regarded as a philosopher; he competed, not without success, for one of the seven chairs of the Sages, and a work by him was held to lurk under the name of a rival Sage. Diogenes in his preface says (13) τούτοις προσαριθμοῦσιν Ἀνάχαρσιν τὸν Σκύθην, Μύσωνα τὸν Χηνέα, Φερεκύδην τὸν Σύριον, Ἐπιμενίδην τὸν Κρήτα· ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ Πεισίστρατον τὸν Τύραννον. He uses similarly vague language I. 108, and Hermippus who wrote περὶ τῶν ἐπὶ σοφῶν (VIII. 88) lends no countenance to Pisistratus; the best authority for the legend is Aristoxenus, who repeats it again without definite origin: I. 108 φησὶ δ' Ἀριστόξενος [ἐν τοῖς σποράδην, *fr.* 89] ὅτι ἔνθεν



καὶ ἄδοξος ἦν (sc. Myson) ὅτι μὴδὲ πόλεως ἀλλὰ κόμης, καὶ ταῦτα ἀφανούς. ὁθεν διὰ τὴν ἀδοξίαν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ τινὰς Πεισιστράτῳ περιθεῖναι τῷ τυράννῳ. The two statements, that Pisistratus took Myson's seat among the Seven and published a book under his name, or at all events was the author of Myson's book, evidently go back to the same sources, legends which Aristoxenus recognized—that is to say, to the fourth century. There is more than this. Pisistratus founded the first public library, according to Athenaeus 3a, and Gellius VII. 17 makes him a book-collector. This assertion naturally hails from Pergamos, and Pisistratus again takes the wind out of Ptolemy's sails. Who is responsible for the next I do not know, but in the scholia to the *Peace* 1071 on the word *Bákis* we read ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐπίθετον Πεισιστράτου. It is difficult to see what Πεισίστρατος ὁ Βάκις can have been intended to mean except that Pisistratus himself was the author of part at least of the corpus of oracles which was among his *instrumenta regni*.

There was, therefore, as early as the fourth century what we may call a Pisistratean mythology in existence, according to which he was a philosopher, a writer under an assumed name, and an oracle-poet. These traditions were accepted at a later period by the grammarians of Pergamos, who saw in this versatile monarch a rival to the founder of their enemies' Museum.

When the fourth-century Megarian antiquaries set about to manufacture a pedigree for their country, and were estopped by the silence of Homer, and alleged the falsification of that authority, they found the falsifier in the Athenian monarch in whose period Salamis had been taken from them, and about whom already a mist of tradition had begun to gather. The despot had been brought down to the world of the pen; the pseudo-Myson and the pseudo-Bakis would have no difficulty in editing an entry in the *Catalogue of Ships*. As the monarch Pisistratus took Salamis, Pisistratus the sage, writer, and poet forged his title.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The patriotic activity of these Megarians suggests to me a consideration with regard to Theognis. The current hypotheses as to the origin of the actual poems appear to me all incredible, even after the careful account of Professor Hudson Williams. On the other hand, there are certainly difficulties in the way of believing the verses to have come as they stand from the hand of their author, enormously exaggerated as these difficulties are. Moreover, we have to account for the paradox that Theognis, a reactionary Megarian *émigré*, should have survived while Solon, father of the Athenian democracy, Moses, poet and merchant, instinct with all

the qualities which Professor Lehmann-Haupt has given him, a source for history and wisdom, and constantly quoted, has undoubtedly perished, and never a papyrus has brought a line of him, save as a quotation, to light. It occurs to me that the idea of a patriotic or Megarian origin of the edition has not yet been considered. Patriotism sticks at nothing; the indisputable poetical merits of Theognis (Solon had those of our own Tupper) may have suggested to these Irelands in a good cause to fortify him by incorporating bits in the same vein from other elegiacs. If they attempted this they succeeded.

T. W. ALLEN.

QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD.



PLATO, *SOPHIST* 244 C.

IN the last number of the *Journal of Philology* (xxxii. 63, p. 136) a change of punctuation in *Sophist* 244 C, together with a new interpretation, is proposed. To this serious exception must be taken; or perhaps not too serious, because the proposal can hardly be due to anything but haste and want of revision. It is not only in disagreement with a familiar idiom, but is easily seen to be inconsistent with the context, which can have barely received attention. The passage is as follows: ΞΕ. τό τε δύο ὀνόματα ὁμολογεῖν εἶναι μὴδὲν θέμενον πλὴν ἐν καταγέλαστόν που. ΘΕΑΙ. πῶς δ' οὐ; ΞΕ. καὶ τὸ παράπαν γε ἀποδέχεσθαι τοῦ λέγοντος ὡς ἔστιν ὀνομά τι, λόγον οὐκ ἂν ἔχον. On this Apelt, in his new edition of Stallbaum's Commentary, has written quite rightly, λόγον οὐκ ἂν ἔχον respondet antecedenti illi καταγέλαστόν που ut non opus sit mutatione. . . . Ceterum ad totius loci sensum nihil interest, utrum ἔχων an ἔχοι scribatur.

In reply to this it is said: 'Καταγέλαστόν που' is to be carried forward from the former sentence, and the comma after ὀνομά τι should be expunged. Translate: "And, again, surely it is absurd to accept from anyone the statement that there is a name which cannot have a definition."

Λόγον ἔχειν, put absolutely, was in the time of Plato and Aristotle a current phrase with the established meaning 'to admit of an account being given of it': an account not in the sense of definition, but of 'justifying account,' and so λόγον οὐκ ἔχειν regularly meant to be unreasonable. No mention whatever is made of this in the above, and yet it was imperative to give some instances of deflection from the normal usage to the supposed more general meaning. The new interpretation could not be defended merely on the ground that in itself λόγον ἔχειν could mean 'to admit of definition.' For it is a familiar fact that a phrase which from its composition might have had a certain signification never has it in the idiom of the spoken language, but has become entirely confined to another possible signification. This is a common source of mistake in speaking or translating a modern foreign language, and the interpreters of ancient texts should remember it.

But whether λόγον ἔχειν ever had the sense of admitting of definition or not, at any rate it could not have that sense in this passage.

In the preceding context a difficulty had been pointed out in the Eleatic doctrine that only the One exists. For, according to this, the One has being, and thus is established the existence of the two names One and Being. This

would be a difficulty for those who affirm that only the One exists, and accordingly follows the passage above quoted:  $\Xi$ . τό τε δύο ὀνόματα ὁμολογεῖν εἶναι μηδὲν θέμενον πλὴν ἐν καταγέλαστόν που. Θ. πῶς δ' οὐ;  $\Xi$ . καὶ τὸ παράπαν γε ἀποδέχεσθαι τοῦ λέγοντος ὡς ἔστιν ὀνομά τί, λόγον οὐκ ἂν ἔχον. Θ. πῆ; The new interpretation involves that the last words καὶ τὸ παράπαν γε κ.τ.λ. are a part of the difficulty just explained. But it should have been observed that the particles τε . . . καὶ naturally imply two different results, each constituting a separate difficulty. And the fact is that the words καὶ τὸ παράπαν γε do introduce a new difficulty, the nature of which is explained in two sentences, connected by τε and καὶ which follow—τιθείς τε τοῦνομα κ.τ.λ. and καὶ μὴν ἂν ταῦτόν γε κ.τ.λ. That they do not form the conclusion of the first argument ought to have been suggested at once by the interrogation which immediately follows them, which seems to have been quite overlooked.

Theaetetus asks, 'How?' (πῆ;), and this introduces the explanation of the new point. Now, if the proposed interpretation had been right, the explanation should have been as to why it could not be admitted that there might be a name without a definition to correspond. But there is not a word about any such thing. On the contrary, what is explained is exactly the meaning of the text implied by the ordinary punctuation, and endorsed by Apelt—viz., that the existence of a name at all could not be accounted for or justified on the Eleatic hypothesis. The reason given is, that there being two alternatives—(1) to assume the name different to the thing of which it was the name, and (2) to assume that the name is not different—the first would involve there being two existences, the name and the thing, which no Eleatic could admit, while the second would necessitate that either the name was the name of nothing at all or that it was the name of a name (i.e., because if the name is identified with the thing, the latter becomes a mere name also). All this is so plain that, as already said, one can only attribute the new proposal to haste and preoccupation.

J. COOK WILSON.

## NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS ON LATIN AUTHORS

### (I) VERGIL.

*Aen.* vi. 735 sqq.

quin et supremo cum lumine uita reliquit,  
non tamen omne malum miseris nec funditus omnes  
corporeae excedunt pestes, penitusque necesse est  
multa diu concreta modis inolescere miris.  
ergo exercentur poenis, ueterumque malorum  
supplicia expendunt. aliae panduntur inanes  
suspensae ad uentos; aliis sub gurgite uasto  
infectum eluitur scelus aut exuritur igni.  
quisque suos patimur Manes; exinde per amplum  
mittimur Elysium, et pauci laeta arua tenemus,  
donec longa dies, perfecto temporis orbe,  
concretam exemit labem purumque reliquit  
aetherium sensum atque aurai simplicis ignem.

The supposed difficulties of this famous passage are set forth in Conington's notes. In reality they have been created by a misunderstanding, and chiefly through forgetfulness that the English of *pauci* is 'only a few.' In vv. 743-747 the sense is not (as Page takes it) that the souls dwell in Elysium 'until lapse of time hath removed the ingrown corruption.' This would surely require *donec . . . exemerit . . . purumque reliquerit*.

The fact is that Anchises is explaining his own presence in Elysium at so early a date after his death. If souls require a prolonged purgation before reaching Elysium and the *laeta arua*, how comes it that he himself is already there? The answer is—because he is one of the few in whose case the process was a short one. *Quisque suos patimur Manes*, says he, and the length and nature of the purgation depend upon what your Manes deserve and require. 'All souls go through such punishment and refining as are necessary. We each suffer our own Manes (i.e. suffer what *they* merit), and *only a few of us are so fortunate as to enjoy the happy fields before a long period has removed the impurities* (i.e. only a few of us enjoy that privilege without having to pass through a long experience of the kind).' He is himself one of those who have so escaped (his stains having been but slight), and hence his presence here to meet Aeneas so soon after decease.

## (2) CICERO.

*De Oratore* I. 46. 202.

non enim caudicium nescio quem neque clamatorem aut rabulam hoc sermone nostro conquirimus, sed eum uirum qui primum sit eius artis antistes, cuius cum ipsa natura magnam homini facultatem daret, tamen esse deus putatur.

Wilkins adopts from Tittler the suggestion <auctor> *tamen esse*. But why was *auctor* lost? Madvig's *inuenisse* and Piderits' *adfuisse* are too remote, and at least the former perverts the sense.

I would read *amentasse* for *tamen esse*, the sense being that 'though Nature herself was giving much ability in that way, Heaven is believed to have furnished help to set it in motion' (i.e. supplied the *amentum* to aid its flight). The metaphor is Ciceronian: cf. § 242 a quo cum amentatas hastas acceperit, ipse eas oratoris lacertis uiribusque torquebit.

[The sense of the imperfect would be assisted if we could also read . . . *magnam <iam> homini . . .*]

*Ibid.* 59. 251.

hoc nos si facere uelimus, ante condemnentur ei, quorum causas receperimus, quam totiens, quotiens praescribitur, Paeanem aut munionem citarimus.

See the note by Wilkins, who accepts Ritschl's *hymnum recitarimus*. This may possibly be correct, if the error rose from an inability of the scribe to read the Greek TMNON. Yet *munionem* should imply something more extensive. Moreover, the thing repeated would hardly be a hymn, but rather a phrase or formula to be recited (like ἡ Παῖν) *quotiens praescribitur*. Such a phrase would be TMHNΩTMENAIE or TMHNΩTMHN (i.e. Τμῆν ὦ Τμῆναίε).

## (3) SENECA.

*Epist.* xv. § 9.

Detraxi tibi non pusillum negotii: una mercedula tet unum graecum ad haec beneficia accedet.

The copyist, ignorant of Greek, met with a word which he could not read. He wrote it down as best he could in the form ETVNVM, and remarked that it was *graecum*. The word, I believe, was ΕΙΩΝΙΟΝ (what the vulgar, in dealing with the coster, call a 'chuck-in'), i.e. *una mercedula ἐπώνιον* ('as an extra') *ad haec accedet*. Immediately afterwards we have '*quis hoc*' inquis '*dicit*?' *idem qui supra*. But no one has been mentioned *supra*, and of course that word cannot refer to another letter. The scribe evidently met with the Greek word again, viz. '*quis hoc*' inquis '*dicit ἐπώνιον*?' He thereupon wrote *idem quod supra* ('the same word as before'). As he only wrote the usual abbreviation for *quod*, it was naturally understood as *qui*, answering the question just asked.

*Ep.* xxi. § 10.

cum adieris eius hortulos et inscriptum †hortulis 'hospes, hic bene manebis, hic summum bonum uoluptas est,' etc.

The reference is to the garden of Epicurus, and in the same spirit as that of the diminutive *hortulos* we may emend with *portulis*. In construction *inscriptum* depends on *adieris*: 'when you approach his little garden and the inscription on its little gate' (literally 'the saying inscribed').

*Ep.* xl. § 10.

aliquis tam insulsus interuenerit quam qui illi singula uerba uellenti, tamquam dictaret, non diceret, ait 'dic, †numquam dicas?'

Suggestions are *num iam* and *numquid*, but *dicas* is left entirely without point. The rude question actually put was *numq: manducas?* i.e. *numquid manducas?* ('Are you chewing something?'). This exactly suits *singula uerba uellenti*.

*Ep.* lxxx. § 1.

non crepabit subinde ostium, non alleuabitur uelum. licebit uno <. . .> uadere, quod magis necessarium est per se eunti et suam sequenti uiam.

Prof. Summers supplies *actu*, which undoubtedly gives the sense. The word actually lost, however, is *tono* (or *τόνω*), the omission being due to the preceding—TVNO.

*Ep.* cvii. § 1.

ubi magnitudo? tam pusilla tangit? serui occupationes tuas occasionem fugae putaverunt.

Conjectures are *tangunt* (Summers) and *te angunt*. It is, however, difficult to account for the corruption *-it* for *-unt*. Rather *res* has fallen out before *ser-*, and we should read *tam pusilla te angit res? serui*, etc.

*Ibid.* § 3.

praeparetur animus contra omnia: sciat se uenisse ubi tonat fulmen.

Read . . . *ubi tonat*, <*fulgurat, cadit*> *fulmen*.

*Ibid.* § 10.

quare impigri atque alacres excipiamus imperia, nec desimus hunc operis pulcherrimi cursum.

Erasmus proposed *deseramus*; but why the corruption? I should prefer *nec desimus huic . . . cursu*. The dat. *cursu* may have misled one who would have expected *cursui*, and *cursu* might easily be read as *cursu*.

#### (4) HORACE.

Though textual criticism of Horace must be approached with all diffidence, there is little doubt that his peculiar vogue in the schools has created for the traditional text a pseudo-sanctity which it is often far from

deservin  
which a

Do  
the text  
hamper  
this clas

On thi  
'The M  
reading  
and he  
objectio  
publicae  
tion in

No  
is it equ  
for etia  
'though  
property  
might p  
real est  
emphas  
'all the  
being m  
of Gree

UNIV

In th  
III iv. 50

deserving. The result is too frequently a number of strained interpretations which a scholar would hardly tolerate in the case of a less familiar author.

Doubtless there are places in which interpretation is itself at fault, while the text is sound. In these, I fancy, the mind of the mature scholar has been hampered by the prepossession of the dogma *quo semel est imbuta recens*. To this class, I believe, belongs the passage in *Od.* III. 24. 3 sq.:

caementis licet occupes

Tyrrhenum omne tuis et mare publicum.

On this Dr. Gow, in his excellently businesslike school edition, remarks: 'The MSS are divided between *publicum*, *Apulicum*, and *Ponticum*. Of these readings, the first is nonsensical; the second unmetrical; the third incredible,' and he therefore adopts Palmer's *sublicis*. To that alteration there are strong objections: (1) the position of the merely conjunctive *et*: (2) the fact that *sublicae* do not suggest wealth: (3) the technical improbability of the termination in *-is* being converted into one in *-um*.

Now it is true that *Apulicum* is unmetrical and *Ponticum* incredible. But is it equally true that *publicum* is nonsensical? If to a scholiast *et* can stand for *etiam*, and if it may so stand to us, it is hardly nonsensical to render 'though with your concrete you may take up all of even that No-man's property the sea,' i.e. *licet omne occupes etiam mare publicum*, or, as a Greek might put it, *καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν τὴν κοινὴν οὖσαν*. The land may be somebody's real estate, the sea is *publicum*. *Omne* is, of course, in the best place for emphasis. *Tyrrhenum* may be (1) adjective, and its position due to the thought 'all the Tyrrhene sea even (as well as the shore),' or (2) = *Tyrrhenorum*, Horace being more disposed to use (as Vergil would) the gen. in *-um* in a lengthy word of Greek suggestion (= *τυρρηνῶν*).

T. G. TUCKER.

UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE.

(To be continued.)

#### A CORRECTION.

In the *CLASSICAL QUARTERLY* for January, 1912, page 42, line 23, the MS. reading at [Tibullus] III iv. 50 should have been given as *ferat*, not *ferant*.

## THE EPITAPH OF HELVIA PRIMA.

(Bücheler, *Carm. Epigr.* 960.)

Tu qui secura spatiaris mente uiator  
et nostri uoltus derigis inferiei,  
si quaeris quae sim, cinis en et tosta fauilla,  
ante obitus tristeis Heluia Prima fui.  
coniuge sum †Cadmō fructa Scrateio†  
concordesque pari uiximus ingenio.  
nunc data sum Diti longum mansura per aeuum  
deducta et fatali igne et aqua Stygia.

Bücheler assigns this epitaph to the Caesarian epoch: and it is clearly not of later date. The fifth line is corrupt. Bücheler suggests tentatively the insertion of the word *dilecto* after *Cadmō*. That will indeed give us a verse of six feet. But we shall not be much the happier. We shall still have to believe that a member of the *gens Helvia* married, circa 100-50 B.C., a husband of the name of Cadmus Scrateius. He must have been the public executioner: for I know of no other Cadmus in Rome; and he bore no very good reputation, and very little deserved the epithet *dilectus*, for the commentators upon Horace S. i. 6. 39 speak of him as 'notae crudelitatis.' He must be supposed to have taken the name Scrateius to make himself more terrible. But where in all the Graeco-Roman world he found it, it is impossible to guess.

We must begin again, and try and arrive at a more plausible result. Cadmus Scrateius is a stone-cutter's blunder. But surely it is one not very difficult to correct. CADMO is a misreading of CADVLO, and Cadulo is a mispronunciation of *Catulo*. *Scrateio* can be nothing but *Isocrateio*. But our verse is still metrically deficient, and we want moreover a substantive to go with our adjective *Isocrateio* and to stand in apposition to *Cadmō*. We shall remedy both defects at once if after the word *fructa* we insert the word *actore* (lost by haplography *ucta-acto*):—

coniuge sum Catulo fructa actore Isocrateio.

(*actore* = *patrono*, *oratore*).

Two Catuli of the first century B.C. were distinguished for their oratory. The one, Q. Lutatius Catulus, was consul with Marius in 102 B.C. The other, his son, Q. Lutatius Catulus Capitolinus, held the consulship in the year in which Sulla died. Either of these might very well be the Catulus of this epitaph. The oratory of the father is highly praised in Cicero, *De Oratore*: and the qualities for which it is praised are precisely those which might merit the epithet *Isocratean*. In *De Orat.* 3. § 28-29 he is actually brought into connection with Isocrates. He himself wrote epigrams in verse, of which one has been preserved to us in Cicero *De Nat. Deor.* 1. 79. The style of that piece makes it quite possible that our epitaph should be assigned to the age of Marius rather than to that of Caesar. The elder Catulus, however, is known to have married Domitia, the sister of Cn. Domitius, Trib. 104 B.C. We must, therefore, if we are to connect him with this epitaph, suppose him to have been twice married. If on the other hand we prefer to bring the date of the epitaph down to a later generation, there is nothing to prevent our identifying its Catulus with Q. Lutatius Catulus Capitolinus. His oratory is said to have resembled that of his father. Cicero in the *Brutus* (§ 133) refuses to rank either with the great orators at all (despite the praise bestowed on the father in the *De Oratore*). Both, however, seem to have achieved in oratory a reputation which was not merely contemporary.

H. W. GARROD.



## THE TRUE CAUSE OF THE PELOPONNESIAN WAR.

In an article in the *Classical Quarterly* of October, 1911, Mr. Guy Dickins criticized certain views put forward by Mr. Cornford, by the writer of the article on Greek History in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, and by myself, on the statements made by Thucydides as to the cause or causes of the Peloponnesian War.

Mr. Dickins makes three statements as to the views which he supposes me to hold. Not one of the three statements is even approximately correct.

The first is as follows (*Classical Quarterly*, p. 238): 'Athens was compelled to interfere in the north-west, owing to the necessity of opening out new sources of corn-supply and of providing for her unemployed.'

This statement is doubly wrong. In the first place, I do not mention the unemployed in this connexion; nor do I anywhere imply that the question of unemployment had anything to do with this phase of Athenian policy. In the second place, I do not speak of any 'necessity' of opening this new [*sic*] source of supply. What I do say is clearly stated in my published volume on *Thucydides* (p. 328): 'But Sicily was an all-important resource to her in case she were cut off at some future time from the Pontus; and her connexion with that region through the narrow waters of the Hellespont and Bosphorus was in the very nature of things most precarious.'

I speak of a possible eventuality, not of a necessity, which is a very different thing.

Secondly, Mr. Dickins credits me with the assertion that 'the inland communities (sc. of Peloponnese) were afraid of a blockade, and the loss of their imported corn.'

I do not speak of a blockade in reference either to the preliminaries of the war, nor yet even in relation to the first few years of the war. It did not form any part of the strategy of Athens as laid down by Pericles. I refer to the words which Thucydides puts into the mouth of the Corinthians in their speech at the Congress at Sparta (Thuc. I. 120), words which threaten plainly a possible stoppage of the sea-route from Sicily by the Athenian alliance with Corcyra.

Thirdly, Mr. Dickins (*Classical Quarterly*, p. 239) professes to quote actual words of mine: "Thucydides is wrong," says Dr. Grundy, "but excusably so, since he is writing after the end of the war, when the original causes have been obscured by the new developments which arose very soon after the war began."

It may be surprising to those who have read Mr. Dickins' article, but have not read my book, to learn that these words, though placed within inverted commas, are not to be found in that book. Nor are they a correct expression of any views which I have ever put forward. What I have said is to be found in that part of the book where it might be expected to be found—in that chapter in which I am dealing with the causes of the Ten Years' War (pp. 322, 323).

In that chapter I express myself somewhat cautiously on this thorny question—with far more caution than that with which Mr. Dickins credits me. I felt, and I

also said, that the probability is that Thucydides is right; though I was not prepared at that time to express an opinion as to the exact sense in which we are to understand his assertion. I was not, indeed, called upon to do so, because I was writing the story, not of the whole war, but of the Ten Years' or Archidamian War. But I have since then been carrying on my work on Thucydides; and I am now prepared to state the conclusions to which I have come—conclusions which, as will be seen by those who care to read them, do not imply that Thucydides was mistaken in his judgment on this important question.

Thucydides' conception of the true cause of the war cannot be understood unless and until we appreciate the time at which it was formed. The evidence for the approximate date of its formation is contained in a clear form in his own work.

His statements on the subject are as follows:

In I. 23 (4) (6), after saying that the beginning of the war was due to the breaking of the Thirty Years' Peace, and that he has in the first place written down *tās airías kai tās διαφοράς* in order that no one should ever be at a loss to know how so great a war arose in the Greek world, he proceeds: 'I think that the most real pretext, but that most kept in the background, was that the rising power of Athens alarmed the Lacedaemonians and forced them to go to war.'

I suggest that the historian means that the causes which he is about to relate are merely those of the outbreak of the Ten Years' War, whereas the *uerissima causa* which he mentions is the cause of the war as a whole.

In I. 88 he recurs again to the statement of the *uerissima causa*, and says: 'The Lacedaemonians decided that the Treaty had been broken and that there must be war, not so much because they were persuaded by the speeches of the allies, but because they feared lest the Athenian power should increase, seeing that a large part of Greece was already subject to them.'

He then proceeds to give the history of the early years of the Delian League, with a view to showing how the great power of Athens arose. In I. 97 he gives unexpectedly a second reason for his digression on the period between the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, namely that Hellanicus, the one author who had treated of the subject, had done so imperfectly. He then continues his story of the Pentekontaetia.

Many modern writers of recent years have pointed out the apparent inconsistency of this statement of the *uerissima causa* with the marked reluctance to go to war which Thucydides himself shows the Spartans to have displayed until within a comparatively short time before the war began.

Mr. Dickins explains this away by suggesting a change in party predominance at Sparta, where the 'War Party' got the upper hand of the 'Peace Party.' In the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, where Mr. Dickins states with more detail his views on Spartan history, I shall try to show that this explanation is open to serious objections.

The real question, as it seems to me, is as to the application of the ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις of Thucydides.

Does he mean to apply it to the Ten Years' War or to the whole twenty-seven years of warfare?

The association of this statement of cause with that story of the Pentekontaetia, which, as the reference to Hellanicus shows, cannot have been written before 406 B.C., indicates pretty clearly that this conception of cause cannot have come to him until he had conceived the idea of the oneness of the war. It seems to me that it is reasonable to suppose that the two conceptions are logically connected; in fact, that he intended this *uerissima causa* of the first book to be the common causal factor running through the whole period of twenty-seven years.

It is, I think, true to say that the human mind tends to form two different con-

cepts of 'cause.' It may conceive of it in one instance, and with regard to a certain consequent, as a momentary or brief-lived phenomenon producing a certain definite effect. But, on the other hand, it may conceive of it as a prolonged causal factor running through a long series of events, and having its effects mingled with those of other causes of briefer duration.

If we regard history as resembling a woven material in which some of the threads of cause and effect give out sooner than others, then we shall, I think, be able without difficulty to apply this second concept of cause to the history of the Peloponnesian War.

The causes of that war, as stated by Thucydides, are three in number:

1. The affairs of Epidamnus and Potidaea.
2. The Megarian Decree.
3. The fear felt by Sparta at the growing power of Athens.

Modern criticism has added a fourth:

4. The trade question between Corinth and Athens.

No one would deny that causes 1, 2, and 4 were in existence at the beginning of the war.

I have already given reasons for believing that cause 4 was not operative in the wide sense in which some would suppose it to have been (Grundy, *Thucydides*, p. 324).

I have also sought to show that, although there had been a terrible set-back to the political power of Athens in the decade between 454 and 445, yet that between 445 and 431 the growth in the economic power of the State had been such as might easily be translated into politics (*Thuc.* p. 323). Thucydides' language does not imply that that growth had been continuous over a long period of years; and can, in fact, only refer to the fourteen or fifteen years between the Thirty Years' Peace and the outbreak of the war. Therefore the third cause was distinctly operative at the time when the war began.

But the real question is how long these four causes respectively continued to be operative during the twenty-seven years of warfare.

The thread of the first cause gave out in the early years of the Ten Years' War. The same was the case with the second. No one would allege that either of these causes had anything to do with either the Sicilian Expedition or the Ionian War.

Nor had the fourth cause anything to do with either of these wars. The allegation that the Sicilian Expedition was undertaken to promote the trade interests of Athens is entirely unsupported by anything which Thucydides says; and he is, after all, our only first-hand authority for its history. In VI. 6 he says that the desire for the empire of Sicily was the only real motive which the Athenians had in undertaking the expedition. In VI. 24 he speaks of the motives with more detail: 'All alike were seized with a strong desire to sail; the older citizens, under the impression that either they would subdue Sicily, or that, at any rate, so large a force could not meet with great disaster: the younger men, from their longing to see with their own eyes a foreign land, and because they were confident of a safe return: the masses generally and the soldiery owing to the prospect of pay for the present, and of the acquisition of an inexhaustible source of pay for the future.' Not a word of trade motives.

And so the thread of the fourth cause seems to have given out before the Sicilian Expedition began.

But what of the third cause—the ἀλθηστάτη πρόφασις of Thucydides?

It is certainly present, in common with the other causes, at the beginning of the Ten Years' War, though it is perhaps somewhat overshadowed by some of them in the pages of *Thucydides*, not because the author does not sufficiently emphasize it, but because he never lived to recast those parts of the first book in which his original

concepts of cause appeared supported by evidence which is so prominent that it tends to obscure the somewhat slender argument of fact by which, in that book at any rate, he upholds the assertion of his late-formed conception.

The Greek States at home, and Sparta in particular, do not seem, at first at any rate, to have realized the wide-reaching nature of the ambition of Athens in undertaking the expedition to Sicily. Corinth seems to have been the first to do so; and subsequently the revelations of Alcibiades left no doubt in the Spartan mind. The Ionian War was undertaken with the deliberate intention of destroying that empire whose continued existence must ever be a menace to the liberties of the Greek world.

Thus the cause which Thucydides asserts to have been that of the whole war is the only one of the four original causes which runs through the whole period of twenty-seven years. Of course it is more effective at some times than at others in that prolonged period; but it is ever there.

We students of Greek history have been too much inclined to treat Thucydides' statement of cause as if that author had merely meant it to be applicable, or to be especially applicable, to the immediate beginning of the war.

We have criticized Thucydides because we have mistaken an intention which the author did not live to make sufficiently clear.

G. B. GRUNDY.

It is not always easy to condense the arguments of several pages into a few sentences, and no doubt condensation gives a definite and dogmatic shape to a view which is in the original rather more conditional; but I cannot, on reperusal of the passages of which Dr. Grundy complains, find myself guilty of any serious misinterpretation of his argument, at any rate as I understood it. With the first remark I would compare the passage of p. 330 of *Thucydides*. 'The two main factors in the position of the Athenian State were: (1) The necessity of importing corn from abroad; (2) the necessity of providing for the unemployed. Hence, in view of the precarious nature of the connexion with the Pontus, Athens could not see any power in the position of being able to cut her communications with Sicily; nor could she for one moment contemplate the possibility of the destruction of her empire.' The second remark is based on two passages on pp. 325 and 326. One is a paraphrase of the Corinthian argument: 'If you let the Athenians get hold of Corcyra, the route to Sicily, and consequently the Sicilian corn-trade, will be in their hands. Of course, States like Corinth, which actually carry on that trade, will suffer most; but your turn will come when you are unable to obtain through Corinth that corn which you purchase through your manufactured and home-grown commodities.' The other runs thus: 'The attitude of the members of the Peloponnesian League is only explicable on the assumption that the measure which Athens had already meted out to Megara might in the future be meted out to them also.' Practically speaking, Megara was in a state of blockade. The inverted commas of the third remark are intended to indicate not a quotation, but a general statement of Dr. Grundy's position like those applied to Mr. Cornford's view on the preceding sentence. It still represents my impression of Dr. Grundy's arguments—*g.*, on pp. 412, 413.

G. DICKINS.

Al  
E  
Tabula  
of Epi  
Nudus.  
Phillip  
Wolf'  
Mrs. I  
Editor

Be  
Au  
P. We  
Kleine  
instru  
Geschic  
century  
A new  
Marqu  
Au  
O. Ber  
the ser  
und hi  
Wilam  
Au  
zung d  
Arpinu  
the pla  
Au  
The no  
tion of  
De anti  
A syste  
China u

Se  
1911 (S  
the Ger  
most in  
Se  
interest  
of Athen  
The illu  
edition.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS.

### LITERATURE AND GENERAL.

#### American Journal of Philology. Vol. 33. No. 3.

E. B. Lease, *The Dative with Prepositional Compounds*. W. S. Fox, *Submerged Tabulae Defixionum*. E. W. Fay, *Lucilius on i and ei*. N. W. De Witt, *A Campaign of Epigram against Marcus Antonius in the Catalepton*. E. H. Sturtevant, *ῥυμνός and Nudus*. Reviews. Hosius, *Sex. Propertii elegiarum Lib. IV*, Ellis, Postgate, and Phillimore's *Catulli, Tibulli, Propertii Carmina* (B. O. Foster). Brief mention: S. L. Wolff's *Greek Romances in Elizabethan Fiction*, Wilamowitz's *Mimnermos and Propertius*, Mrs. Dragoumis's *Tales of a Greek Island*, Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*, etc. (the Editor), Schubart's *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses* (C. W. E. M.).

#### Berliner philologische Wochenschrift. 1912.

Aug. 10. D. Mulder, *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen*, 1910 (Cauer). Long review. P. Wessner, *Ciceros Rede für Milo* hrsg. von P. W. (Klotz). One of Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*. S. Consoli, *A. Persii Flacci saturnarum liber*. It. rec. annot. crit. instruxit, testimonia usque ad saec. XV addidit S.C. (Hosius). Useful. M. Wundt, *Geschichte der griechischen Ethik*. II. *Der Hellenismus*. (Wendland). From fourth century B.C. to second A.D. H. Blümner, *Die römischen Privataltertümer*. (Peter). A new volume in Müller's Handbuch. Supplements and to some extent supersedes Marquardt (last edition 1886).

Aug. 17. F. T. Baldwin, *The bellum civile of Petronius*, ed. by F. T. B. (Helm). O. Berthold, *Die Unverwundbarkeit in Sage und Aberglauben der Griechen* (Pfister). In the series edited by Wünsch and Deubner. L. Malten, *Kyrene. Sagenhistorische und historische Untersuchungen* (Aly). In the series edited by Kiessling and Wilamowitz.

Aug. 24. J. H. Lipsius. *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren*. Unter Benützung des Att. Prozesses von Meier u. Schoemann dargestellt. II, 2. (Thalheim). *Arpinum. Bollettino del Museo Civico di Arpino* (Klotz). Pierleoni seeks to identify the places mentioned in Cic. *De legibus*.

Aug. 31. I. Bywater, *Aristotle on the art of poetry* (Crönert). Very high praise. The notes on the language of Ar. are better than Vahlen's owing to careful observation of Ar.'s usage, and especially comparison with that of Plato. I. Tambornino, *De antiquorum daemonismo* (L. Ziehen). In the series ed. by Wünsch and Deubner. A systematic collection of material. A. Herrmann, *Die alten Seidenstrassen zwischen China und Syrien* (Gerland).

Sept. 7. G. A. Gerhard, *Ein Heidelberger Fragment aus Menanders Perikeiromene*, 1911 (Schmidt). F. Cumont, *Die Mysterien des Mithra* (Wolff). Second edition of the German translation, with additional matter by the author. Includes a list of the most important publications on the subject since 1900.

Sept. 14. L. Gautier, *La langue de Xénophon*. Geneva, 1911 (Gemoll). An interesting study, especially of the vocabulary. J. E. Sandys, *Aristotle's Constitution of Athens*. Second edition (Rabe). Sketches the improvements in the new edition. The illustrative passages quoted should be revised with the latest texts in the next edition. H. F. Pelham, *Essays* (Peter). Appreciative.

Sept. 21. J. Burnet, *Plato's Phaedo*, ed. by J. B. (Raeder). Reviewer discusses the Introduction. C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, *Armenien, Einst und Jetzt*. I. 1910 (Ruge). Includes sections on the Retreat of the Ten Thousand and the position of Tigranokerta. J. T. Sheppard, *Greek Tragedy* (H. F. Müller). A good introduction to the subject.

Sept. 28. J. P. Postgate, *Dead language*, etc. (Niedermann). P. treats the subject with refreshing originality. G. Helmreich, *Galen de usu partium libri*, rec. G. H. Vol. II., 1909 (Koch). The Index of 'Vocabula memorabilia' is valuable. Th. Stangl contributes to this and following numbers a series of notes 'Zur Textkritik des Valerius Maximus und Julius Paris, des Velleius und Tacitus.'

Oct. 5. P. Hinneberg, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, hrsg. von P. H. Teil I. Abt. VIII. *Die griechische und lateinische Literatur und Sprache*. Third edition (Peter). This important book has been much enlarged and improved. Wilamowitz has added fully 80 pp. to his sketch of Greek Literature; Wackernagel (Greek Language) has expanded the section on the language of the earlier inhabitants of Greece; Fr. Leo added considerably to his sketch of Roman Literature in the second edition and has again carefully revised it. Fr. Skutsch (Latin Language) has rewritten the section on the relation of Latin to Greek, Celtic, and Germanic and has added a short note on Horace. G. Dickens, *Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum*. I. (Brueckner). Highly praised.

Oct. 12. XAPITEΣ Fr. Leo zum sechzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht (Helm). Reviewer sketches the contents of a number of papers by L.'s former pupils. Sjögren's interpretation of some passages in Cic.'s letters is warmly praised. Ch. Huelsen, *Die Thermen des Agrippa* (Hermann). An attempt to construct a plan of the Thermae with the help of some Renaissance drawings.

Oct. 19. A. E. Taylor, *Varia Socratica* (Lortzing). Full discussion. R. B. Steele, *Case usage in Livy* (Kalinka). The collection of examples useful. Fr. Cramer, *Das römische Trier. Ein Beitrag zur Kulturgeschichte des römischen Rheinlandes* (v. Behr).

Oct. 26. H. Merguet, *Lexikon zu Vergilius*; M. N. Wetmore, *Index verborum Vergilianus* (Kalinka). Merguet died 1911; but the rest of the book will be published soon. M. Schanz, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* II., 1 (Helm.) 3rd ed. Has grown from 372 to 604 pp.; records and estimates all recent work on the subject. G. Apelt, *De Romanorum precationibus* (Richter). A. Philippson, *Topographische Karte des westlichen Kleinasien* (v. Hiller). Highly praised.

Nov. 2. W. J. M. Starkie, *The Clouds of Aristophanes* (Süss). 'The commentary deserves the highest praise.' C. W. Mendell, *Sentence connection in Tacitus* (ed. Wolff). Valuable contribution to the understanding of Tac.'s art; a sort of dictionary to his syntax and style. E. Wagner, *Fundstätten und Funde aus vorgeschichtlicher, römischer ... Zeit im Grossherzogtum Baden* (Goessler). The Roman remains are described with thorough knowledge by F. Haug.

Nov. 16. S. Marck, *Die Platonische Ideenlehre in ihren Motiven* (Pavlu). Strongly recommended. O. Rossbach writes notes on Sophocles *Ichneutae* and *Eurypylus*.

Nov. 23. W. Headlam, *Agamemnon of Aeschylus* (Wecklein). The chief merit of the book lies in the citation of a very large number of new parallel passages. Many of the changes in the text are daring and anything but certain. Fr. Brentano, *Aristoteles und seine Weltanschauung* (Apelt). B.'s long familiarity with Aristotle makes him worth reading, even if one does not agree with him. J. Höflinger, *Bobiensia. Handschriftliche und textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Bob. Ciceroscholien* (Stangl). F. Steffens, *Proben aus griechischen Handschriften und Urkunden*. 24 Taf. in Lichtdruck. (Gardthausen). An introduction to the study of Greek palaeography.



**Classical Philology.** Vol. 7. No. 4. 1912.

A. Shewan, *The Homeric Augment*. A. Gudeman, *Two Textual Problems in the Dialogus of Tacitus*. E. H. Sturtevant, *Studies in Greek Noun-Formation: Labial Terminations III*. B. L. Ullman, *Horace* serm. I. 6. 115 and the History of the Word Laganum. R. J. Bonner, *Evidence in the Areopagus*. A. L. Wheeler, *Satura as a Generic Term*. Notes and Discussions. G. M. Calhoun, *Xenophon Hellenica I* 1. 27-29. Max Radin and E. T. M., *The Case of the Marcelli*. P. Shorey, *Emendation of Theophrastus De Sensu* 64 (*Diels Vorsokratiker* 375. 44).

**Classical Weekly** (New York). 1912.

May 25. W. Warde Fowler, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People* (C. H. Moore). The reviewer would go farther in maintaining that a belief in a future life of rewards and punishments was widespread in the middle of the last century before our era. W. Ridgeway, *The Origin of Tragedy* (W. S. Burrage). Referring to p. 28. on ἀπιδουκ in Hdt. 5, 67, the reviewer says, 'Yet an examination of this word's history would seem to show that the meaning 'assign' is later than Hdt. This meaning is a favourite one with the classifying philosophers, Plato and Aristotle.'

Oct. 5. E. P. Morris, *Horace, The Satires and Epistles*, edited with Introduction and Notes by E. P. M. The short Introduction 'abounds in stimulating suggestions.'

Oct. 19. O. Hoffmann, *Geschichte der griechischen Sprache* (Sturtevant). G. M. and G. F. Whicher, *On the Tibur Road—A Freshman's Horace* (H. L. Cleasby).

Oct. 26. T. Rice Holmes, *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* (W. Dennison). 'Question after question of vital and practical interest to the student and teacher of Caesar are discussed in Mr. H.'s virile and attractive style.' A. Meillet, *Introduction à l'Étude Comparative des Langues Indo-Européennes*. Third edition (E. H. Sturtevant). As an introduction . . . the book is without a serious rival. The revision, while thorough, is confined to matters of detail.'

Nov. 16. E. G. Hardy, *Six Roman Laws* (F. G. Moore). Bears abundant traces of exact scholarship, combined with historical and legal acumen.

**Deutsche Literaturzeitung.** 1912.

Aug. 24. E. H. Sturtevant, *Labial Terminations*. I. II. (A. Debrunner). Author has achieved what was possible.

Aug. 31. L. Roudet, *Éléments de phonétique générale*. Clear, modern, and precise, but restricted to the Indo-European languages.

Sept. 7. A. Mayer, *Theophrasti περὶ λήξεως fragmenta* (A. Kraemer). Much depends on the subjective view of the editor, but a good foundation is laid for future work.

Sept. 14. C. Meinhof, *Die Urgeschichte im Lichte der afrikanischen Linguistik*. I. H. Peter, *Die Schrift Origo gentis Romanae* (J. W. Beck). Assigned to the end of the fourth century A.D. R. Cagnat, *La frontière militaire de la Tripolitaine à l'époque romaine* (R. Grosse).

Sept. 21. C. Meinhof, *Die Urgeschichte*, etc. II. The Hamitic languages must be recognized as supplying the oldest known type of inflected language. V. Brochard, *Études de Philosophie ancienne et de Philosophie moderne* (A. Goedeckemeyer). The author has a clear conception of the historical character of philosophy, and escapes the common error of interpreting ancient ideas by modern. C. Rothe, *Die Ilias als Dichtung* (E. Bethé).

Sept. 28. S. Mekler, *Aristophanes und die Nachwelt*. P. Persson, *Beiträge zur indogermanischen Wortforschung*. 2 Teile (R. Trautmann). Contains a mass of etymologies, examines thoroughly the theory of 'bases' and 'determinatives,' and refutes the fantastic 'Ablaut' theories of Hirt and others.



**Deutsche Literaturzeitung** (continued).

Oct. 5. A. E. Housman, *M. Manilii Astronomicon lib. II.* (A. Kraemer). This edition and that of H. W. Garrod mark a decisive advance on the last German edition. The abuse of German editors becomes tedious. P. Asdourian, *Die politischen Beziehungen zwischen Armenien und Rom von 190 vor Chr. bis 428 nach Chr.* In spite of faults, gives a fair picture of what is known of Armenia in Roman times.

Oct. 12. E. Kornemann und Paul M. Meyer, *Griechische Papyri im Museum . . . zu Giessen* (W. Schubart). J. Paulson, *Index Lucretianus* (A. Körte). This work, long delayed by the author's illness, has now been carried to completion by the help of his niece, Frä. Esther Nilsson. Its completeness deserves every praise.

Oct. 26. G. A. Gerhard, *Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung* (E. Bethe). Contains fragments of two MSS of the *Iliad*. The style of publication is extravagantly costly.

Nov. 2. R. W. Livingstone, *The Greek genius and its meaning to us* (O. Immisch). L. characterizes ably the merits of Greek literature of the fifth century, but should enlarge his views of later Greek and of Roman writers. A. S. Hunt, *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta papyracea* (P. Maas). An editio minor of the four larger tragedy-papyri of Oxyrhynchus. A. Meillet, *De quelques innovations de la déclinaison Latine* (H. Jacobssohn).

Nov. 9. A. Gercke and E. Norden, *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft* (W. Kroll). Corresponds to Sandys and Whibley's *Companion*.

Nov. 23. A. Goedeckemeyer, *Die Gliederung der aristotelischen Philosophie* (W. W. Jaeger). G. Baehrens, *XII Panegyrici latini*, it. rec. G. B. (C. Hosius). A conservative treatment of the text.

Nov. 30. H. Usener, *Kleine Schriften* (W. Aly). C. F. Lehmann-Haupt and E. Kornemann, *Klio*. Bd. IX-XI. (J. Kromeyer). The subject-matter as well as the list of contributors' names is world-wide.

**Hermes**. Vol. 74. No. 3.

W. Sternkopf, *Die Verteilung der römischen Provinzen vor dem mutinensischen Krieg*. W. Crönert, *Die Sprüche des Epicharm*, containing a new collation of the Hibe fragments. G. Finsler, *Ἐδνα*. In the *Telemachy* the bride's father pays the dowry, in the rest of the *Odyssey* it is a gift from the suitor to the lady. O. Viedebant, *Metrologische Beiträge I*. The system of Solon: Attic weights in the second century B.C.: Ptolemaic liquid measures. H. Dessau, *Die Zeit der Epigramme des Honestus*, in support of Jamot's view that they contain a reference to Julia, daughter of Augustus. K. Praechter, *Der Topos περὶ σπονδῆς καὶ παιδείας*. This is derived directly or indirectly from Athenodorus' tract, which bore this title. P. Corssen, *De versibus in Euripidis Medea falso iteratis*, discusses vv. 923, 1006-7, 40-41 = 379-380. L. Deubner, *Kerkidas und Epicharm*. In *Ox. pap.* viii. p. 35. *Frag.* 2. col. ii. 6. *θεὶ κη. αὐ.* . . must refer to Epicharmus *Frag.* 216 (Kaibel) *πάντα θεὶ κηλαίνεταί*.

## Vol. 74. No. 4.

M. Holleaux, *Arads et Mithridates*. These have been assumed to be sons of Antiochus the Great on the strength of Liv. xxxiii. 19. They were probably generals who acted as mentors to the young princes Antiochus and Seleucus in the campaign of 197. K. Reinhardt, *Hekataios von Abdera und Demokrit*. Hekataios is one of the sources used by Diodorus: his relation to Epicurus and Democritus: Lucretius bk. V is drawn from D's *Μικρὸς διάκοσμος*. W. Capelle, *Das Proömium der Meteorologie*, defended as the genuine work of Aristotle against Martini. C. Robert, *Aphoristische Bemerkungen zu Sophokles' Ἰχνηρεαί*. O. Viedebant, *Metrologische Beiträge II*. Deals with the measures of Egypt, Greece (Pheidon), Asia Minor, Babylon, and Persia. P. Corssen, *Eur. Med.* 1224-1230, should be transferred so as to follow 295-305. W. A. Baehrens, *Note on the sources of the De Mortibus persecutorum*.

Jon  
An  
On Ari  
Garrod  
on the A  
the Lex  
J. Cook  
Henry  
Mn  
P.  
edition,  
traditae  
exercise  
Verr. l.  
vicesima  
with the  
yi ὁβελ  
de iure  
Hartma  
tions of  
Mu  
Pau  
of the B  
Poukeu  
principal  
Neu  
D.  
pre-Myc  
stituents  
Meteora-  
monaste  
Iliad; 1  
Poetic; 1  
and patr  
XX  
J. G.  
of the o  
of the p  
Homer a  
means o  
Greek ep  
Christian  
poetry o  
humanis  
Metopenb  
the pott  
illustrati  
of E. G.  
Dialogus.  
and 17, n  
in 74 (Ce

**Journal of Philology.** Vol 32. No. 63. 1912.

Andrew Lang, *Dictys Cretensis and Homer*. Arthur Platt, *Homericæ*. The Same, *On Aristotle de animalium incesso*. The Same, *Notes on Agamemnon*. H. W. Garrod, *Notes on the Poetae Latini Minores*. E. G. Hardy, *The Speech of Claudius on the Adlection of Gallic Senators*. The Same, *Notes on the lex Iudiciaria of G. Gracchus, the Lex Servilia of Caepio and the Lex Thoria*. Ingram Bywater, *Aristotelis V.* J. Cook Wilson, *Plato Timaeus* 37 C. J. D. Duff, *Some Notes on Lucan VIII*. Henry Jackson, *On some Passages in Plato's Sophist*.

**Mnemosyne.** 40. 4. 1912.

P. H. Damsté, *Spicilegium criticum ad Flori epitomas*. Criticisms of Rossbach's edition, and conjectures. A. Kurfess, *De invectivis quae tamquam Sallustii et Ciceronis traditae sunt*. Against Schwartz, Wirz, etc., K. argues that the former is a rhetorical exercise; the latter is by a later and inferior hand. J. J. Hartman, *Ad Ciceronis Verr. I. III*. Corrections of §§ 3, 86, 89, 118, 122. J. A. Vollgraff, *De propositione vicesima septima libri Archimedis de lineis spiraliibus*: an interpolation, since it conflicts with the preceding propositions. I. E. Kalitsunakis, *Ad Timaei glossarium*: s.v. ἀπόβειν γὰρ ποθεν, for ΙΧΜΕΡ read ΚΟΜΗΡ, καὶ Ὀμπρος (a 10). J. C. Naber, *Observatiunculae de iure Romano* (continued). On hereditatis possessor and edictum de inofficioso. J. J. Hartman, *Ad Plutarchi Moralia annotationes criticae* (continued). Studies and emendations of five essays (pp. 48-100 = Bernardakis I. pp. 118-243).

**Musée Belge.** VI. 2.

Paul Graindor, *An episode in the life of Herodotus Atticus*. R. Nihard, *The problem of the Bacchanals of Euripides*. An acute criticism of current interpretations. J. B. Pouqueux, S.J., *Syntax of Latin Inscriptions in Africa*. VI. 3. Waltzing, *The three principal MSS. of Tertullian's Apology*. Remainder of Syntax of Latin Inscriptions.

**Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum**, etc. XXIX. 8. 1912.

D. Fimmen, *Die Besiedlung Böotiens bis in frühgriechische Zeit*. A review of pre-Mycenaean and Mycenaean remains in Boeotia, and the evidence for the constituents of its pre-Boeotian population. J. Dräseke, *Die neuen Handschriften in den Meteora-Klöstern*. On the astonishing discovery by N. A. Beys in these Thessalian monasteries of 1124 MSS, including a Chrysostom dated 861-2; a 13th century *Iliad*; 15th century MSS of Hesiod, Soph. *Ajax* and *El.*, Dem. *de Cor.*, and Aristotle *Poetic*; a very good MS of Aristides and Themistius; and a host of important biblical and patristic texts. W. Nestle, *Friedrich Nietzsche und die griechische Philosophie*.

## XXIX. 9. 1912.

J. Geffcken, *Antike Kulturkämpfe*. An attempt to correlate the successive forms of the opposition of religion and ethics to lay poetry: the competition with Homer of the poetry of ecstasy and prophecy; the Sibyl and Apollo; Xenophanes against Homer and Hesiod; Plato and poetry. Then come the utilization of lay poetry by means of extracts and allegorizing, poems by philosophers, Jewish adaptations of Greek epos and drama, reflections of Plato's dialogues and Greek romance in early Christian literature; till with Juvenius and Prudentius Christianity grew a Roman poetry of its own, while Gregory of Nazianzus and Apollinaris of Laodicea acted as humanists to the Christianity of the East. B. Laum, *Die Entwicklung der griechischen Metopenbilder*. The development of the artistic treatment of quadrilateral fields from the pottery of Cnossos and Troy to the metopes of the 6th century (33 pp., with illustrations; to be continued). R. M. Meyer, *Kritische Poetik*. A. Klotz, review of E. G. Sihler's *Annals of Caesar*. A. Gudeman, *Das Gesprächsdatum von Tacitus' Dialogus*. T.'s choice of A.D. 74-5, which does not fit the reckonings of chaps. 16 and 17, must have something to do with the chronological reforms made by Vespasian in 74 (Censorinus 18. 13).

**Philologus.** LXXI. Heft 2. 1912.

W. Fröhner, *Kleinigkeiten*. Emendations in Callimachus, Babrius, Petronius, Martial (V. 78. 31 *Claudiam sequeris*; C=aqua Claudia), etc. H. Jurenka, *Pindaros neugefundener Paean für Abdera*. An exhaustive investigation of the subject-matter and circumstances of the Paean. Also a commentary with several suggestions for the text—e.g. *ἔρεκον* l. 29. to be retained: it refers to Abderite assistance in the rebuilding of Athens. A. Mayer, *Die Chronologie des Zenon und Kleantes*. A discussion of the evidence given in Philodemus *περὶ τῶν φιλοσόφων* (= Apollodorus). W. Bannier, *Die römischen Rechtsquellen und die sogenannten Cyrillglossen*. Demonstrates by parallel citations, the sources of this collection of glosses. W. Soltau, *Bot Diodors annalistische Quelle die Namen der ältesten Volkstribunen?* Comparing Livy II. 56, 58 and Diodorus XI. 68 decides that the details in D. were not contained in the annalistic source. E. v. Druffel, *Papyrus Magdola* 38+6. Argues that the two fragments form one piece. P. Lehmann, *Cassiodorstudien*. (1) Notices of the *Chronicon* of C. in the Middle Ages. (2) The dating of the *Institutiones* and *computus Paschalis*, with special reference to J. Chapman's *Notes on the Early History of the Vulgate Gospels*. E. Stemplinger, *Die Etudes latines von Leconte de Lisle*. De Lisle's imitations of the Odes of Horace. W. H. Roscher, *Die Artemiskult von Cumae*. Confirms Boll's suggestion of a cult of Artemis in Cumae by Verg. *Aen.* vi. 35 sqq. Id., *Φθορεῖα oder Φθορεῖα?* proposes to complete *φθορεῖ* . . . (Dittenberger Syll<sup>2</sup> 567) to *φθορεῖας* (= *φθορᾶς*=abortus), not *φθορεῖων* (edd.). A. Laudien, *Handschriftliches zu den Viten Plutarchs*. A. E. Schöne, *Zu Tacitus*. Agric. 27. 5. for *non uirtute*, sed *occasione et arte ducis rati* proposes *non uirtute se, sed occasione et arte uictos rati*. *Ducis = duci s. = duci scilicet*, a gloss on *umi* in the preceding sentence, has ousted *uictos*. M. Manitius, *Zu Sallusts Jugurtha*. Readings from a text of the *Jugurtha* (13, 9 to 15, 2) written at end of Rotomagensis 1470. Eb. Nestle, *Lateinische Bibelstudien in Wittenberg* 1529. An account of an edition of a portion of the Latin Bible (largely based on the Hebrew original) which was published in Wittenberg in 1529. W. Soltau, *Roms Gründungsjahr bei Ennius* proposes to connect Ennius frag. 501 with Livy V. 40. 2. Livy has altered the mythical chronology. E. Schweder, *Plinius Nat. hist.* III. 95. For *tenuere primi . patet . . .* read *tenuere . primus patet . . .*

**Rheinisches Museum.** LXVII. 4. 1912.

E. Scheer, *Beiträge zur Erklärung und Kritik des Aischylos*. Long elucidations and emendations of *Ag.* 45 ff. (in connexion with *Cho.* 246 ff.), 661-6, *Cho.* 61-81, 269-290, 573-4, and, incidentally, of *Ag.* 1443-4, *Cho.* 361, 573-4, 995 (1003), *Sept.* 463, *Eur. El.* 1003, etc. W. Bannier, *Zur Stilistik der älteren griechischen Urkunden*. A long study of the repetitions, with or without variation, of recurrent words and phrases in inscriptions, and in similar documents in literary texts; and the bearings of this evidence on the question of excising superfluous repetitions e.g. in *Lysias* 6. 44, *Isaeus* 3. 52, *Aeschines* 2. 76, 99, 3. 121, 184, 214. A. E. Anspach, *Isidori Hispalensis 'Institutionum Disciplinae'*. A. publishes and discusses a new little tract by I. which he has found in a Paris MS. But the '*Isidori de numeris*' which Lindsay thinks he has found at Cologne is only a compilation from I.'s *Etymologies* and elsewhere. J. Mesk, *Zur Technik der lateinischen Panegyriker*. From an analysis of the form and disposition of the anonymous pieces M. concludes that x (ii) and xi (iii) are by the same hand, and that v (viii) is akin to the speech of Eumenius, but that we cannot ascribe them all to a single author. O. Seeck, *Politische Tendenzgeschichte im 5. Jahrhundert n. Chr.* An elaborate demonstration that the *Historia Augusta* dates from the reign of Honorius, and reflects upon earlier times and events from 392 onwards. A. Brinkmann, *Scriptio continua und Anderes*. I. On *ἄν* 'so' and *ἄν* 'at any rate', in papyri and late Greek; *ἄν* never became a mere link. II-VI. Words written continuously in MSS have often been wrongly misdivided, e.g. in Reichardt's edition of *Johannes Philoponus de officio mundi*, the Bonn edition

## Rheinisches Museum (continued).

of Herakleitos *Homeric Problems*, Hanow's edition of Claudius Ptolemaios *περί κριτικῶν καὶ ἡγεμονικῶν*, Lagarde's edition of Titus of Bostra *Against the Manichees*. The text of these works is further discussed. P. Corssen, *Die Heimat der Phönissen des Euripides*. After dismissing Murray's view that these Phoenician women came from Carthage, C. reinterprets 202-213, taking *ἵνα κατανέσθην* as an unreal final clause. J. M. Stahl, *Nachtrag über die εἰσφορά*. An arithmetical supplement to his article (see C. Q. 1912, p. 277). M. Wallies, 'Οξύνυχος-Schrift. Cf. C. Q. 1912, p. 133. K. Preisendanz, *Anth. Pal.* V. 191. The διπλοῦν γράμμα of Συρηκοσίων is σν (σι): invert this, and the courtesan becomes a pig.

## Rivista di Filologia e d' Istruzione Classica. Vol. 40. No. 4. 1912.

A. Gandiglio, *Observations on the Syntax of Concord in Latin*. Details with exx.

1. Several infinitives as subjects. Predicate is in sing. unless plurality is insisted on.
2. Several abstract subjects in *masc.* Sall., Livy, Tac., Aur. Victor, Lactantius have exx. of pred. adj. in *neuter plural* where generic force of neuter is not insisted on. So Livy 10. 4. 10.
3. If subject is a noun only used in plural, a noun, as predicate or in apposition, will *not* be in plural, unless it is of common gender (e.g. *dux*) or has distinct forms for both genders (*magist-er, -ra*).
4. Names of places conjoined with common names. A (1) If the subject is the name of a town, etc., and is accompanied by a noun signifying an *inhabited place* (*urbs*, etc.), the predicate agrees with the latter, though sometimes there is *constructio ad sensum*, the inhabitants being put for the habitat. (2) Otherwise, it agrees with the subject. B (1) If the subject is a common noun, followed by a proper one, the predicate agrees with the common noun, though here too *constructio ad sensum* occurs. In Livy 4. 61. 6 'Volscorum oppidum' is an interpolation.
5. The same principles apply to cases where there is a participle or adjective, also in apposition. Exceptions, 'oppidum Nisibis . . . distantem . . .' Tac. A. 15. 5. 'Corioli, Volscorum oppidum, capti . . .' Val. Max. 4. 3. 4, are very rare.
6. So where a relative or demonstrative pronoun follows, it agrees with the common noun.
7. *Constructio ad sensum* dominates where the proper name is that of a person—e.g. Cic. *Tusc.* 1. 77 'deliciae meae, Dicaearchus . . . dissensit.'
8. When *plus* etc. (= *plus* etc. *quam*) are followed by an expression of number, the predicate agrees with this and not with the *plus*.
- L. Pareti, *Contributions to the History of the Hannibalic War* (concluded). § 7 On the route of Hannibal from Trasimene to Gereonium. Hannibal must have passed from the neighbourhood of Cales by the road from Calvi to the neighbourhood of Riardo. The Roman army that was to intercept him would be partly on the hills to the E. towards Vesciano and Zuni, and partly on those in front, or on Monte Maro, while the cattle with flaming horns were driven along the road from Calvi to Rocchetta. Issuing from the pass, H. would go to the W. of Riardo and E. of Pietravairano, and so reach that of Allifae at the foot of the chain of Matese. § 8 Operations near Gereonium. P. argues that the engagement of G. has been duplicated and that this accounts for the statement of the sources that Fabius and Minucius were dictators simultaneously. Gereonium is Castel Dragonera. The account of the events of 217 adopted by Polybius had already been doctored in the interests of Fabius.
- § 9 Chronology of the War. If we do not demand extreme accuracy, which is not to be expected from ancient writers, the dates of the events are fairly certain. P. gives them in chronological order. O. Nazari, *Latin and Greek etymologies* (continued). Lat. Sab. *ancus* (*ancilla*), Gr. ἀγκώνος (Hes.) and διάκονος (from δια + ακ-ονος, cf. διηνεκής, etc.). But ἐγ-κονεῖν, ἐγ-κονίς, ἐγκονητή, ἀκονισί are connected with *conor*. *ελογιον* is not from ἐλεγείον, but from εἰλογία. *ludus* (*luidos*) is connected with *lacio*, λίθος. *niger*, properly 'dirty,' is from rt. *nigh*, 'wash,' in νίω, χίρ-νιβον, etc. Compare *lutum*, L. *lutum*, by *λούω*, *lauo*. E. L. De Stefani, *Menand. Fab. Inc.* I. (Körte, p. 95) Redistribution of the dialogue in vv. 17-19.

**Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie.** 1912.

12 Aug. J. Heckenbach, *De nuditate sacra sacrisque vinculis* (W. Nestle). 'An excellent work.' K. Conradt, *Die metrische und rhythmische Komposition der Komödien des Aristophanes* (K. Löschhorn). Part 3 (*Wasps, Peace, Ecclesiazusae, and Plutus*).

19 Aug. (double number). H. Francotte, *Mélanges de droit public grec* (Fr. Cauer). A collection of various contributions. A. Leissner, *Die platonische Lehre von den Seelenteilen* (G. Lehnert). 'Essentially furthers our knowledge of Platonic psychology.' *Manilius Astronomicum*, lib. II, rec. A. E. Housman (M. Manitius). 'Contains all that is important for criticism of the text.'

2 Sept. Fr. Pfister, *Der Reliquienkult im Altertum*. I (H. Steuding). This part deals with the objects of the cult; the second will deal with their nature and history. *Taciti Historiarum libri*, rec. C. D. Fisher (Ed. Wolff). 'Has many corrections of Halm.' P. Riewald, *De imperatorum Romanorum cum certis dis et comparatione et aequatione* (E. Hohl). 'A careful and diligent collection of material.'

9 Sept. P. Scheller, *De hellenistica historiae conscribendae arte* (A. v. Mess). 'A valuable dissertation.'

16 Sept. W. H. Buckler and D. M. Robinson, *Greek inscriptions from Sardinia*. I (W. Larfeld). 'Of the highest interest.' T. R. Holmes, *Caesar's conquest of Gaul*. Second edition (Ed. Wolff). 'A standard work.' Th. Kipp, *Humanismus und Rechtswissenschaft* (Th. Opitz). 'This excellent exposition.'

23 Sept. H. Ahlers, *Die Vertrauensrolle in der griechischen Tragödie* (K. Busche). 'A good and wide survey of this subject.' E. Stechert, *De Catonis quae dicuntur distichis* (M. Manitius). 'A thoroughly sound dissertation.'

30 Sept. R. Vetschera, *Zur griechischen Paränese* (H. Mutschmann). 'A survey remarkable for perspicuity.'

7 Oct. M. Croiset, *Observations sur la légende primitive d'Ulysse* (W. Dörpfeld).

'Worth reading.' P. J. Enk, *Ad Propertii carmina commentarius criticus* (O. Güthling). 'To be most warmly commended.' G. Heidrich, *Rutilius Namatianus* (M. Manitius).

14 Oct. *Isocrates*, Cyprian orations, by E. S. Forster (J. Tolkiehn). 'Well adapted for upper classes and students.' Gr. Lazić, *Über die Entstehung von Ciceros Schrift De legibus* (W. Isleib).

21 Oct. J. Kromayer, *Antike Schlachtfelder* 3. Band: *Italien und Afrika*. 1. Italien von J. Kromayer; 2. Afrika von G. Vieth (R. Grosse) I.

28 Oct. J. Kromayer, *Antike Schlachtfelder* (R. Grosse) II. D. Brock, *Studies in Fronto and his age, with an appendix on African Latinity, illustrated by selections from the correspondence of Fronto* (C. Weyman). 'Does equal honour to the diligence and the good heart of the authoress.'

4 Nov. R. Pagenstecher, *Unteritalische Grabdenkmäler* (H. Lamer). 'Makes a great field of antique civilization accessible to us.' L. Havet, *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins* (Th. Stang). Severely criticized.

11 Nov. W. Deonna, *L'Archéologie. Sa valeur, ses méthodes*. I, III (H. L. Ulrichs). 'A very comprehensive and learned work.' R. Hirzel, *Plutarch* (B. V. Hagen). 'Shows a thorough knowledge of Plutarch.'

18 Nov. J. Kohler und E. Ziebarth, *Das Stadtrecht von Gortyn und seine Beziehungen zum gemeingriechischen Rechte* (Fr. Cauer). 'Greatly furthers our knowledge of Greek life.' E. Wolf, *Sentenz und Reflexion bei Sophokles* (S. Mekler). A contribution to his poetical technique.

25 Nov. W. Havers, *Untersuchungen zur Kasusyntax der indogermanischen Sprachen* (R. Wagner). 'Deserves to be read.' W. Ridgeway, *Minos the Destroyer rather than the Creator of the so-called 'Minoan' culture of Cnossos* (E. Reisinger). A criticism of Evans. 'Has not convinced me.' O. Blank, *Die Einsetzung der Dreissig zu Athen im Jahre 404 v. Chr.* (Fr. Cauer). 'A thorough and comprehensive examination of sources.'

Glo  
K.

(1) a da  
for the f  
occasion  
Bergk's  
and Bler  
παῖδες  
Word-fa  
ancient  
on an A  
Etrusca  
the Rom  
e.g. Γάιο  
F. S.

(1) on t  
classical  
a strong  
Latin is  
initial s  
scabellum  
dence of

IV.

K.

mere 'c  
only wh  
presence  
Bechtel  
4 250;  
as ἐπὶ τῷ  
of classic  
and quis  
discusse  
contribu

Ind

F.

maintain  
cases of  
γάλα; ἄ  
of (1) I  
said to b  
its insist  
language  
slight p  
neglect  
(3) C. V  
book is

## LANGUAGE.

## Glotta. IV. Band, 1 and 2 Heft. 1912.

K. Witte discusses *The Origin of the Ionic Hexameter*, which was made up of (1) a dactylic *Vierheber* ending in a disyllabic word, (2) a *Zweiheber*; this accounts for the frequency of bucolic diaeresis in the Homeric poems (60 per cent.). (1) was occasionally used as a separate line by early Greek poets, e.g. Alcman in fr. 16 in Bergk's *Anthol. Lyrica* (ed. Crusius). E. Fraenkel, *Graeca-Latina*; notes on *Iteratives and Blends*; θέμης; κλήειν; ἀμφιανακτίζειν; -κ- and -ν- suffixes; νίκος; κνήστις; παχίζειν [cf. 'to shin']; *primores*; *hibernum*. F. Hartmann, *The Treatment of Latin Word-families in Teaching*, with examples to show how much can be done to illustrate ancient life by tracing the history of word-groups. P. Kretschmer, *A Greek Inscription on an Apulian Vase*. A. Rosenberg and G. Herbig contribute two articles on the Etruscan language, and M. Lambertz deals at great length with the *Super-nomen* in the Roman Empire, including a collection of such names topographically arranged, e.g. Γάιος Ἰούλιος Ἑρμῆς ὁ καὶ Μερκούριος (Bithynia).

F. Skutsch, *The Latin Accent*; maintains the current theory of a stress accent (1) on the first syllable in early Latin and (2) on the penult or antepenult in the classical period. The early accent is due to the influence of Etruscan, which had a strong stress on the first syllable of each word. So-called 'vowel-weakening' in Latin is due to the colouring by neighbouring sounds of vowels almost destroyed by initial stress, e.g. *conscando* > *conscndo* > *conscendo* cf. *scabnololom* > *scabnolom* > *scabenlom* > *scabellum*. The expiratory character of the classical accent is proved by the coincidence of the verse-ictus and word-ictus in the 'scenic poets.'

## IV. Band, 3 Heft. 1912.

K. Witte, *Vowel-contraction in Homer*. The later Ionic forms in Homer are not mere 'concessions to the spoken language of the poet's day, but were introduced only where pre-existing analogous forms not only justified but even called for their presence.' The writer sharply criticizes and rejects the conclusions arrived at by Bechtel in his *Vowel-contraction in Homer* (1908). J. Wackernagel, *On Pind. Pyth.* 4. 250; -άφιον; ὄσον ὄσον. Nachmanson, *On -μν-*. A. Debrunner explains ἐπιούσιος as ἐπὶ τὴν οὐραν ἡμέραν 'for the day in question.' E. Löfstedt, *Notes on some passages of classical and vulgar Latin*. V. Ussani, *Ariamne* = *Ariadne*. R. Methner, *On aliquis and quisquam*. F. Weidner finds a Sumerian origin for βάβραπος. R. C. Kent discusses the orthographic rules of Lucilius; W. A. Baehrens and H. Petersson contribute notes on various Greek and Latin words and constructions.

## Indogermanische Forschungen. XXX. Band, 5 Heft and Anzeiger. 1912.

F. Sommer, *The Indogermanic Personal Pronoun*. Among other hypotheses S. maintains the priority of the short vowel in ἡμιν ἡμίν; *Od.* 23, 211, and 16, 171 are cases of metrical lengthening. E. Schwyzler, *Etymologies*: ἀγανός; κατ' ἀνθρώπων; γάλα; ἔναρα; ἰσθίης; παῖω; τάλας. After a full index to the volume come reviews of (1) L. Gautier, *La Langue de Xénophon* (Meltzer); very favourable; the book is said to be valuable as an investigation of the non-Attic element in X., especially in its insistence on the dialectal origin of words generally regarded as loans from the language of poetry. (2) C. E. Bennet, *Syntax of Early Latin*. Vol. i. (W. Havers); slight praise and much trenchant criticism of the author's mechanical method and neglect of the obvious parallels to Plautine usage afforded by the Italic dialects. (3) C. W. Mendell, *Sentence Connection in Tacitus* (Meltzer); very favourable; the book is a real help to a better understanding of T. as an artist and psychologist.



**Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung. XLV. 2.**

†F. Solmsen, *Wieder einmal Kavδανλας*. The first member of the compound <\*k<sub>h</sub>g- seems to indicate that in Thracio-Phrygian the palatal was replaced by a velar guttural in such cases, cf. Lett, *kuna*. E. W. Fay, *Composition or Suffixation*. I. It is shown that in apparent derivatives by means of the 'suffixes' -igo, -ugo, -ago, in Latin, we have really compounds. II. *The Latin suffix* (-u)lentus. *Violentus*, 'made violent by wine,' is modelled on *uiolentus*, itself an extension of \*uiolus <\*uisiolus: *uellerere* on the analogy of its semantic opposite *lentus*. *Opulentus* <\*ope-polentus <\*pollentus: *pollens*. *Corpulentus* = *corpi-pollens*. *Pestilens* <\*pesti-tulans. W. Prellwitz. Lat. *horreum*, 'winter store,' is formed from the loc. of *horrum*, 'the inhospitable season': χέρρος, as *cauea*, from *cauei*, etc. A. Zimmerman, *Das Suffix -ercus im Latein*. The praenomina *māmus*, *māmercus* < *māmarcus* (cf. Μάμαρος, *mam-marius*) belong to *māma*, *mamma*, so *mārcus* to *mā*. Similar formations are *lupercus* <\*luparcus, *nouerca* <\*nouera < *noua* on analogy of *altera*. W. S[chulze], *Δωριεὺς Δωριμάχων*, cf. Kor. Δωρίμαχος or Δωρίμαχος. κραάρα < κρησείρα is an Elean form. F. Bechtel, *Eretrische Namen*. W. Prellwitz, *zu idg. ap(e)lo-*, 'Kraft, Hülfe.' The Elean name *Teurianphlos* is a compound of *Teuri-*: *teutā*, and *aphlos*: 'Ἀπέλλων, 'Ἀπόλλων O.N. *apl*. E. Fraenkel, *Zur Geschichte der Verbal-nomina auf -σίο- -σία*. Collection and discussion of examples. *πανοικίη*, a loc. like *νηπουίη*, etc., with *πασσινδεί* supports the view that *πανοικίη*, *πασσινδεί*, etc., were originally locatives. W. S[chulze], *Osk. amfret*. K. Meister, *Genetrix, monitrix u. Verwandtes*. Discussion of the penultimate vowel in Latin words ending in *-etrix*, *-itrix*. W. S[chulze], *Osk. deiuatud u. lat. diues*. *Diues* means 'favoured by the gods,' 'rich,' cf. Sl. *bogatŭ*. Σφηνόπους. Here η = ā not ē. The Hesychian σφάνιον is a short form.

**THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION.**

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. Members receive a copy of the annual 'Proceedings' of the Association and of 'The Year's Work in Classical Studies' (both post free). They may also obtain the *CLASSICAL REVIEW* and *CLASSICAL QUARTERLY* at the reduced price of 7s. and 9s. a year respectively (post free), provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public—viz., 7s. 6d. for the *CLASSICAL REVIEW*, 12s. 6d. for the *CLASSICAL QUARTERLY*, or 18s. for the two Journals jointly, post free in each case.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Secretary, Mr. M. O. B. Caspari, University College, London; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. G. Warre Cornish, The University, Manchester; Mr. R. W. Reynolds, King Edward's School, Birmingham; Mr. K. Forbes, 135, Chatham Street, Liverpool; Mr. E. P. Barker, 5, Park Avenue, Mapperley Road, Nottingham; Miss E. Newcomb, 19, St. Helena Road, Redland, Bristol, and Mr. R. H. Soltan, the University, Bristol; Mr. J. M. MacGregor, Bedford College, London, W.; and the Rev. Father Ailingier, S.J., St. Xavier's College, Bombay.



compound  
ed by a  
uffixation.  
ugo, -ago,  
iolentus,  
f \*uiolus  
Opulentus  
sti-tulans.  
um, 'the  
as Suffix  
os, mam-  
lupercus  
Δωπτικός  
orm. F.  
he Elean  
Απόλλων  
tion and  
ports the  
ze], Osk.  
e penul-  
deiuatud  
hynórov.

ment and  
ress upon  
national  
g; (c) to  
to create

he annual  
fee of 5s.  
n and of  
so obtain  
ice of 7s.  
be paid  
that date  
LASSICAL  
Journals

the Hon.  
the Hon.  
ish, The  
Birming-  
r, 5, Park  
na Road,  
r. J. M.  
ger, S.J.,